BR 75 .B36 1828 v.3
Barrington, John Shute
Barrington, 1678-1734.
The theological works of the
first viscount Barrington

THE

THEOLOGICAL WORKS

OF

THE FIRST

VISCOUNT BARRINGTON,

INCLUDING

THE MISCELLANEA SACRA,

THE ESSAY ON THE DISPENSATIONS,

AND

HIS CORRESPONDENCE WITH DR. LARDNER,

NEVER BEFORE PUBLISHED.

TO WHICH ARE PREFIXED,

A LIFE OF THE AUTHOR,

WITH

A BRIEF MEMOIR OF HIS SON, SHUTE BARRINGTON,

THE LATE BISHOP OF DURHAM,

BY THE REV. GEO. TOWNSEND, M.A.

PREBENDARY OF DURHAM, AND VICAR OF NORTHALLERTON.

IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOL. III.

LONDON:

C. AND J. RIVINGTON, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD,
AND WATERLOO PLACE, PALL MALL.

1828.

PRINTED BY A. J. VALPY, RED LION COURT, FLEET STREET.

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

CONTENTS OF VOL. III.

PAGE

Dissertations illustrative of the Essay on the Dispensations.

I. On the Temptation, the Fall, and the Sentence which God pronounced on the Serpent, the Woman, and the Man 1

II. Concerning God's visible Presence and Appearance, Face and Glory, as they occur in Scripture . 19

Exposition of 1 Peter iii. 17—22. 53

Exposition of several Portions of the Book of Genesis 61

Dissertation on Galatians iii. 16. 99

Dissertation on Hebrews xii. 22—25. . . . 111

Letters between Lord Barrington and Dr. Lardner . 139

Texts of Scripture explained, paraphrased, or otherwise illustrated 357

INDEX 359

PRINCETON
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY

DISSERTATIONS

ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE

ESSAY ON THE DISPENSATIONS.

DISSERTATION THE FIRST.

ON THE TEMPTATION, THE FALL, AND THE SENTENCE WHICH GOD PRONOUNCED ON THE SERPENT, THE WOMAN, AND THE MAN; IN A LARGE PARAPHRASE ON THE THIRD CHAPTER OF GENESIS.

I CONSIDER the third chapter of Genesis to be the real history of the fall, and to be inserted by Moses as the history of the origin of moral and natural evil, between the history of the creation, in the first and second chapters, and the peopling the world, the rise of arts and sciences, and other the most early and remarkable occurrences, to the flood, in the fourth and following chapters. I can by no means consider it as a parable. The insertion of a parable in the middle of a history, without giving us any notice of its being a parable, would not have been by any

means worthy of so accurate an historian, as the writer of this history will, upon strict observation, appear to be. Nor can the accounts, which the patrons of this opinion give us of it as a parable, induce a reasonable man to come to such conclusion. I do not see that they make any thing of it as a parable, though some of them have been men of the finest imagination. Nor can I suppose it to be a history of small account. On the contrary, I consider it to be of the greatest consequence towards understanding the true sense of Revelation: being an account of the origin of natural and moral evil, which is ever supposed, and very often expressly referred to, from one end of the Bible to the other.

But though I interpret it as a history, yet it is written after the Eastern manner. That alone has made some interpret it as a parable. And, as I take it to be an history of so much consequence, I will endeavour, by a proper paraphrase, to represent the whole of it together in such a manner, as to remove, if possible, all the objections which have been made to its being a real history.

But the account must first be taken in that the sacred historian gives us of the circumstances in which the man and the woman were placed when the temptation began. It is shortly this: Jehovah God had put the man in the garden which he had planted in Eden. By Jehovah God,

Moses means the Logos.[1] He had made the ground of the garden to produce every tree which was pleasant to the sight, or good for food; and, among other trees, the tree of life in the midst of the garden; and by it also the tree of knowledge of good and evil, or the tree of death. He had told him, he might eat of all the other trees; but that he must not so much as touch the tree of death, much less eat of it; for that in the day he did eat thereof he should surely die. Moreover, He had ordered the man to dress, prune, and keep the garden, as an agreeable exercise and recreation. He had given him dominion over the animals; and, in token of their subjection, He had brought them to him, to receive names from him: but not for that end only, but also that He might let him see, by their coming in pairs, that a help-mate for him was yet wanting; and yet that it could not be found among the creatures which he had surveyed. God had framed him an help-mate from one of his own ribs, and had brought her to him; from whence Adam either discovered the law of matrimony, or had it immediately revealed to him. Finally, He had clothed both the man and the woman with a garment or covering of dignity, betokening their being children of God, and heirs of the blessing, though they had been naked at the first.

[1] See the Dissertation, No. II.

After God had placed them in these blissful circumstances, the devil, or Satan, the head of the fallen angels, envying this happy pair this state of blessedness, resolved to try to tempt them to eat of the forbidden tree; on which sin, misery, and death at last, must ensue: whereby, instead of retaining the image of God, in which they had been created, they would become like their tempter, who had lost it, and was in every respect the reverse of it. This temptation the devil carried on in the following manner:

Finding the woman alone, he takes the shape and figure of a serpent. This he did, because the woman knew, from the name which Adam had given the serpent, that the serpent was a beast of the field, of greater subtlety and sagacity than any other; and was therefore the fittest to raise the woman's attention to what should follow. He also took the shape of this animal for another reason; namely, because the serpent was probably then of an erect figure, and made a glistering and shining appearance; designing presently by that means to transform himself, as it were, into a flaming seraph, or an angel of light, and a messenger from heaven.[1] In this figure, we may suppose, after first playing some wily and artful tricks, like a serpent, before her, he at last plucked of the fruit of the tree of death, and

[1] See 2 Cor. xi. 3. Gal. i. 8.

did eat of it; and then, putting on a more seraphic or angelical appearance, bespoke the woman after this manner: "You see how the fruit of this tree has exalted me; so that from a beast of the field I am become a glorious seraph, and endued not only with speech, but with the knowledge of the Divine will, which has not yet been fully opened to you by God himself. Can God possibly, do you think, have really intended, that you should not eat of the fruit of every tree of the garden, and of this in particular, which He Himself has made and planted there? What did He make and place it there for, then?" To which the woman replied: "God has kindly permitted us to eat of any of the other trees of the garden, besides that which grows in the midst of the garden; but that He has absolutely forbidden us to eat of, or even so much as to touch it, because its fruit is deadly, and will certainly kill us." To which the serpent replied: "No; you are greatly mistaken; the fruit is not deadly, nor will it kill you, any more than it has me. Alas! all that God meant, by saying it would destroy you, was, that it would change and transform you. But so far will it be from making you cease to be, that in the day you eat of it, it will open and enlighten your eyes, as it has mine; and as it has raised me from a serpent to a seraph, endued with speech, and with knowledge of the Divine coun-

sels concerning you, so it shall likewise raise you from being mortals to be gods; and, instead of bringing death on you, make you immortal, like the great Creator Himself; giving you the same kind of knowledge of good and evil that He has. You shall then know the way to possess all the good you enjoy indefeasibly and independently, as He does; and you shall know how to avoid death, the threatened evil, which would for ever put an end to all your bliss and felicity. Even disobedience itself will not then be able to bring it upon you. In fine, you will find this tree to have the like power to improve and raise your minds, as the tree of life has to preserve your bodies." The woman, upon this, looking wishfully upon the fruit, and being then strongly and wickedly prejudiced by the insinuations of the devil; and observing that it was a tree bearing a fruit that looked to be good for food, as well as the rest of the trees of the garden, and of a most exquisite shape and hue; and, above all, desirable for the attaining this impious knowledge, which the serpent had absurdly and maliciously flattered her with; from seeing him so much improved, as it should seem, by it; and being then, from this foolish lust of low and mean appetite, and of an high and presumptuous ambition, willing to believe him a glorious seraph, and a messenger from heaven, against her own strong reasoning before,

she took of the fruit of the tree, and did eat; and gave also to her husband (now) with her, adding many fond persuasive arts to that purpose, and he took of it from her, and did also eat.

As soon as they had both eaten of it, so far were these vain and delusive hopes, that the serpent had given them, from being made good, that they presently found that they had forfeited all the blessedness which God had given to them. The first thing was that they were stript of the robe of dignity and felicity that God had covered them with, as the badge of the high relation they bore to Him, and of that inheritance of which they were possessed; and that they were now as naked as they had been at the first: and though they foolishly endeavoured to supply the defect of this glorious covering, by a kind of garment or covering of fig-leaves, or fig-branches, yet they still found they had the same reason to be afraid of Him (notwithstanding that He had been their kind and indulgent Father, while they continued His obedient offspring) as they had had before they had made themselves this new covering; since they could not but still see that He was now become their justly incensed Judge; and that the coverings they had made themselves could not possibly prevent His seeing that they were stript of the

glorious garment, that was to be theirs as long as they continued obedient to His commands.

Jehovah God calls Adam before Him, who tells Him, "That hearing His voice in the garden, and finding himself stript of the garment which God had given him, as a son of God, and consequently deprived of the relation he stood in to Him, he was afraid, and had hid himself." Whereupon Jehovah God said to him, "Who told you that you was naked? I, indeed, told you, when I gave you that garment, that you should be immediately deprived of it, if ever you did eat of the forbidden tree. What then, have you eat of that forbidden tree? It is that then which has made you naked." Adam replies, "The woman, whom Thou gavest me, gave me to eat." And the woman said, it was the serpent that beguiled her, and she did eat.

Whereupon Jehovah God calls the serpent, or satan, the devil, in the shape of a serpent; and first pronounces sentence upon him. This was according to the rules of strict justice (he being, with the utmost malice and wickedness, the original deceiver); and it was also according to rules of equity and mercy towards the man and the woman, in order to raise some hopes in them, from passing a sentence on the devil before He passed any on them, who had circumstances that might plead for the Divine

patience, and a farther space to repent. The sentence, that Moses relates God to have passed on the devil, is, as becomes a good historian, suited to the appearance which the devil made; namely, that of a serpent; as he calls angels men, when they appeared in the shape of men. And God said unto the devil, "O proud and wicked spirit, because thou hast thus wickedly and arrogantly tempted and deceived the woman, by the means of the shape of the serpent, pretending as if thou thyself wast a being that could acquire a felicity independent of me, and impart the like to the woman, in direct contradiction to my commands; cursed, therefore, shalt thou be above all cattle, and all the beasts of the field; my power shall immediately deprive thee of that erect and bright figure, by the means of which thou hast made these arrogant and wicked pretensions, and lay thee at the foot of the woman whom thou hast deceived. On thy breast shalt thou go; and instead of being able to pluck the fruit of any tree, thou thyself, whilst thou actuatest that form, shalt be able only to grovel in the dust, and eat what is mingled with it. And the very species, whose form thou hast taken, shall be cursed in like manner; for they also shall be reduced from a beautiful beast of the field to the state of a deformed and mean reptile, as a memorial of

this thy arrogant and presumptuous malice, as a perpetual caution and warning to mankind against thee, and as a farther security to them against thee for ever, by depriving thee of having so fit an instrument, as a serpent is in its present figure and form, to pursue thy temptations by, through putting on the appearance of an angel of light. So little reason will I leave the woman to believe thy arrogant and false pretences for the future; and thereby will I facilitate her returning to the obedience due to me, and prevent her listening again, so easily, to thy wicked and artful insinuations. Moreover, I will not only put enmity between the woman and thee, by shewing her all the baneful consequences of thy temptation, but between all thy imitators, the wicked viperous race of Cain (who will be a liar, and a murderer, like thee, and slay his righteous brother); and between Seth, the true successor of righteous Abel, and his descendants, who shall go by the name of The Children of God. And one from this righteous seed, namely, Jesus, shall bruise thy head, and destroy all this wicked design and contrivance of thine, by overcoming and destroying death itself, which thou hast brought on the human race; and thou shalt never be able to defeat this His kind and gracious intention towards mankind; though, through my permission, thou

wilt be able to afflict Him, and bring Him to die, and even on a tree, as thou hast by a tree brought death on the world. But by His death I will destroy thee, who hast, through my permission, had the power thus to introduce death on the first pair, and on all their race."

To the woman, whom the serpent had deceived, God said, "Though thou mayst learn from the sentence that I have pronounced on thy tempter and enemy, that the fruit thou hast eaten shall not bring death immediately upon thee, but only operate like a slow poison in thy blood; on which, however, death will infallibly ere long ensue: and though thou mayst learn from this sentence too, that I design to preserve thee, for some time, as the mother of a future race; yet a curse shall attend thy fruitfulness, instead of the blessing that I first pronounced upon thee; for I will greatly multiply thy sorrow in breeding children, and in bringing them forth, beyond other creatures; and instead of that independent state of happiness, which the serpent (whom thou now seest groveling at thy feet, in virtue of my curse, notwithstanding his new boasted acquisition) has vainly flattered thee with, if thou wouldst eat the forbidden fruit; and which thou, through the fondness which thy husband had for thee, hast prevailed on him to eat of, as thou hadst done thyself before; from henceforth thy fond desire shall be to him, and

thereby he shall rule over thee, and have thee in subjection; for which there could have been no room, if thou hadst preserved thy virtue and innocence." And to Adam he said: "Since, from a foolish fondness for thy wife, thou hast hearkened unto her voice, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it, when I had made the ground of the garden to produce every tree for thee that is pleasant to the sight, or good for food,[1] therefore, cursed is the ground for thy sake. In vexation and sorrow, for the frequent disappointments of thy care and toil about it, shalt thou eat the produce of it, all the days of thy life; for it shall not any more yield unto thee, of itself, trees bearing fruit, but thorns and thistles; and it shall only bring forth of its own accord the herb of the field, a part of thy food, common to thee and the beasts of the field, who are not able to provide food for themselves; but bread, the other part of thy food, the great staff and necessary support of life, shall the ground not yield to thee, but in virtue of thy labour, and the sweat of thy brow, till thou return to it, out of which thou wast taken. For dust thou art; and now, that I am going to drive thee out of paradise, and from the tree of life, which alone would have preserved

[1] Gen. ii. 9.

such a mouldering frame and constitution as thine to immortality, to dust thou shalt return." Thus Jehovah God passed sentence severally upon the three parties in this transgression; inflicting a punishment on each of them the most properly suited to their respective crimes.

Upon this mild sentence, Adam perceiving, with great joy and thankfulness, that he and his wife were to be continued alive to people the world; he, I say, who before had named her Woman,[1] now named her Eve; as much as to say, "the mother of all living." And though Jehovah God had thus justly expressed His resentment against them; yet, as the man and the woman had lost their garment of glory and dignity; and, as their fig-leaves or branches were not a proper covering for them, Jehovah God, as a farther mark of favour to them, shewed them how to make coats of the skins of beasts, which he had appointed them to offer in sacrifice to Him, for their apparel; thereby, at the same time, holding forth to them this sad moral; that by having indulged their appetites and passions, they had, from children of God, reduced themselves, as it were, to a level with the beasts which perish: but withal encouraging them hereby to hope, that through faith in His mercy,

[1] Gen. ii. 23.

as the most powerful spring of repentance, they might not only escape death at present, but recover from it. And when Jehovah God had provided this clothing for a pair who had too little experience to know how to provide what was fit for themselves; as He had given them a language, and directed them to food and matrimony before; then He, as the great Angel of God's presence and council, said to some other of the angels, His fellows,[1] "Behold, the man has separated himself from us, the faithful sons and ministers of God, by eating of the tree of knowledge of good and evil; and now, lest after the hurt he has justly received thereby, he should put forth his hand to take also of the tree of life, and thereby be healed, and live for ever; therefore I will send him out of this garden, where the ground brought forth trees and fruit spontaneously, to till with toil and hard labour that more barren unparadisaical ground, out of which he was taken. The tree of life he must not eat of; and since he must not, toil and labour will be the best means to preserve his life, as long as it will be fit that it should be continued to him:" So He drove out the man. And He placed at the east of the garden of Eden, cherubims with a glory, or flame, that darted every way (called "a flaming sword," or

[1] Heb. i. 9.

the flame of a sword), to keep the entrance to the garden, and to the tree of life, against all men in this mortal state; but thereby leaving them hopes, that since God did not destroy paradise and the tree of life, but only barred the entrance of them against mortal men before death, that if they became imitators of God, and should no longer be the children of the devil, God, as their gracious and forgiving Father, would adopt them to the inheritance of Eden again, and would after death put them into the possession of it; as He took Adam, and put him in it before he had disobeyed His just and reasonable commands; and as He afterwards took Enoch, and put him there, without tasting death, when he had scarce attained half the age of man in that period of the world, on his walking with God, as Adam had done before the fall.

The great objections that have been made against the third chapter of Genesis being a literal history, are, that the skill of managing the temptation seems to be attributed to the subtlety of the serpent; that a serpent should speak, reason, and design (which is thought to have too much of the marvellous for any thing but a parable); and that God should sentence a beast of the field with the man and the woman, two beings subject to moral government. I hope this paraphrastical account that I have now

given of Moses's history of the fall, will obviate the first and second of these objections. For suppose the expression, "Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field," to be elliptical, then supply it thus, and the objection will vanish: "And therefore the devil made use of the shape and figure of a serpent, to awaken the woman's attention to him; she having been informed by the name which Adam had given the serpent (Nachash), signifying his subtlety, that he was an animal of greater sagacity than any other beast of the field." And as to the last objection, I think the account I have given of the sentence will shew, that it is a sentence on the devil only; and that the reducing the serpent from a beast to a reptile was only in mercy to mankind, in order to shew our first parents, how incapable the serpent was of giving them an independent happiness; and to prevent a serpent being instrumental to the like mischievous designs of the devil for the future. And as to the middle objection, it appears by the paraphrase, that it is not the serpent that speaks, but the devil, called "the serpent," from his putting on the appearance of that beast of the field. If this shall be still thought to have too much of the marvellous for a literal history, I must take the liberty to say, that, if we will receive nothing of the marvellous, we must not only renounce a great many parts of revelation,

but all miracles, and all other attestations of the Spirit (how well soever attested), which are the great external evidence on which all revelation in fact is, and in reason must be, built; whereas nothing of the marvellous, either considered as a part of revelation, or as the evidence of it, can be thought at all strange and improper, when it is duly considered. It is, indeed, what was to be expected: whereas, on the other hand, if there had been nothing of the marvellous in a revelation from God, that itself would have been the most astonishing thing that could have happened; since God would then be supposed to have given us a revelation, without any thing to raise our attention, or to give it a proper attestation.

In fine; I believe, if the state of things be carefully considered, and we would but put ourselves, as precisely as may be, into the circumstances of our first parents in Eden, we should soon see, that the account Moses gives us of the temptation and the fall, considered as a literal history, was as likely and as natural a way for the great enemy of God and mankind to have seduced the first man and woman by, as any we can now possibly devise.

DISSERTATION THE SECOND.

CONCERNING GOD'S VISIBLE PRESENCE AND APPEARANCE, FACE AND GLORY, AS THEY OCCUR IN SCRIPTURE, ESPECIALLY IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

We read of "God's Presence," Gen. iv. 16; and that it was visible is certain; because Abel and Cain "brought their offerings to it;" which signifies the presenting them to a Being that had a visible residence.[1] And that this Pre-

[1] "Brought their offerings to it:"—which signifies the presenting them to a Being that had a visible residence. That this is the meaning of Cain and Abel's bringing their offering, besides what is said above, may farther appear from hence; that the bringing an offering to God, in Moses's style, after the giving the law, is bringing an offering to the Glory of God, which visibly resided among men. For the offering was brought to the door of the tabernacle, or to the temple, where God dwelt. Nor do I believe, if it be well considered, that there are any instances, from the offering of Cain and Abel to the destruction of the first temple, of an offering's being made to God, but where the Being that represented him visibly resided; except the extraordinary case of David, 1 Chron. xxi. 14—30, and of Elijah, 1 Kings xviii. See Mal. i. 8, where the same word, namely, offering, is used,

sence of God was visible, does not only follow from the expression itself, which cannot well be supposed to have any other meaning, but from this Presence of God's visibly accepting Abel's offering, and rejecting Cain's. For God's accepting an offering, is sending a flame from Himself to devour it; Lev. ix. 24. Judges xiii. 20—23. Psal. xx. 2, 3. 1 Kings xviii. 36—40. The same phrase, namely, "God's Presence," is used by Moses, when he prays, that God, and not an angel, may continue with his people, and lead them to Canaan; thereby to distinguish them from other nations, who were supposed to have angels for their governors or presidents. See Deut. xxxii. 8, 9, according to the LXX, Dan. x. 13. 20, 21. "If Thy Presence," says Moses, "go not with us, carry us not up hence," Exod. xxxiii. 14—17. Finally, this Presence is called "God's face," in Gen. iv. 14. From whence too, as something that was visible, Cain says, upon his sentence of banishment, that "he shall be hid." The Presence of God therefore with men is His visible and fixed residence among them, in contradistinction to

of presenting a thing to a governor. And indeed, how could they possibly have brought their offering, if they had not known where they were to bring it? And how could they have known where they were to bring it, if they had not known where the Being resided, to whom they were to bring it?

His appearances, which were but occasional, and of a short continuance. In this sense we are to understand God's "Presence or Face," 2 Kings xxiv. 20. Jer. vii. 15. lii. 3. Psal. li. 11. It signifies His visible residence in the temple, in all those places.

The first period of this visible and fixed residence was from the creation till a little after the flood (when He retired);[1] and then again (after an interval of about a thousand years) from the giving of the law to the destruction of the first temple.

His occasional appearances were to the builders of Babel, in wrath and displeasure; and to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Moses at the bush, in kindness and favour; so that the period of these occasional appearances was the interval between the two periods of His visible and fixed residence.

[1] "The time of His fixed residence was from the creation till a little after the flood, when He retired."—That God resided visibly in the world during this period seems to follow from hence; that till the flood, or rather till just after Noah's coming out of the ark, Moses never introduces God as coming down from heaven, or as appearing, in order to introduce Him speaking to men. And yet, after that time, Moses always introduces God as coming down from heaven, or as appearing, when he would introduce Him as speaking to them. See Gen. xi. 5. xii. 7. xvii. 1. xviii. 21. xxvi. 2. xxxv. 7. 9. This plainly shews, that Moses considered God as visibly residing in the first period, and not in the second.

The place of His visible and fixed residence seems to have been at the entrance of Eden, from the fall to the flood (for which I have given my reasons, in the preceding Essay); in the ark during the flood;[1] and in the tabernacle and the first temple, after the long interval just now mentioned.

"God's face" is His becoming visible, as a brightness covered with a cloud, in a human shape, or in the similitude of a man; and parti-

[1] "In the ark during the flood."—That He resided in the ark during the flood, appears by His saying to Noah, "Come thou, &c. into the ark," Gen. vii. 1, and chap. viii. 16; and, "Go thou out of the ark:" neither of which could have been said, if this Being had not been in the ark. And that He was in the ark during the flood, may be farther inferred from Noah's sacrificing to Him (as representing God), as soon as he came out of the ark; since, as we have just observed, no sacrifices were ever offered to God, but when He had a certain visible residence; and not when He occasionally appeared: as is plain by Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob's not sacrificing, unless in the case of the ram offered instead of Isaac. But that was pointed out to be done by a particular providence, speaking as plainly as if God had expressly commanded it, Gen. xxii. 13, 14, and which must consequently be considered as an extraordinary and an excepted case; as must also the case of Elijah, 1 Kings xviii. 19—41. See the Third Corollary to this Dissertation. From God's being in the ark, we may understand the meaning of that difficult and hitherto mistaken place, 1 Pet. iii. 18—22, the full meaning of which text may be seen in Dissertation No. III.

cularly with the similitude of an human face: and then it is said, that "God, or Jehovah, was present, or appeared;" and He is then said to be "a Man," Gen. xviii. 2. xxxii. 24—31. "God's glory" is His becoming visible, as a great brightness covered with a cloud, without any human shape, or any other shape or similitude at all.

This I take to be the general meaning of these phrases in Scripture, namely, of "God's presence and appearance, His face and glory," particularly in the Old Testament, where they more generally occur. But it is necessary to be more particular, and to prove this more fully from the history of the Bible.

However, it will be fit to premise beforehand, that as the Supreme Being is immense, it is impossible that, properly speaking, He should ever be more present or more absent from us at one time than another. It is in Him that "we all live, move, and exist." As the Supreme Being is immense, He is also incorporeal, unchangeable, and invisible; and therefore cannot have any face or other bodily parts at any time; or be any thing but what He always is; or any thing, at all times, but that Being, "whom no man hath seen, or can see," 1 Tim. vi. 16. See John i. 18. v. 37. 1 John iv. 12. By God's presence, therefore, and appearance, by His face and glory, we must understand the Being, who was afterwards permanently incarnate,

who appeared as a brightness in a cloud, either in the similitude of a man, or without any similitude at all, to represent and personate the Supreme Being, under the character of the Father of His family, or of the King of His people; and always speaking in the name of the Supreme Being, or as the Supreme Being; as, "Behold, I have given thee," &c. Gen. i. 29; or, "I am Jehovah thy God," Exod. xx. 12: while all other Divine messengers, as prophets, angels, or the Word Himself in flesh, speak as from the Supreme Being; as, "Thus saith the Lord;" or, "This is the will of God." This Being, thus personating God the Father, is to be understood by the term God, whenever He is said to be visible: and was so understood by the Israelites.[1] More particularly, I take this Being,

[1] That the Israelites did not think this visible Being to be God the Father, may be justly concluded from this, that the light of nature would teach them, that the invisible God could not be visible; that the incorporeal God could not have a body; that He that is immense could not be confined to a place; nor He that is unchangeable vary His posture, shape, or appearance. It may also be concluded from hence, that the Being, who is called "God's Presence," Exod. xxxiii. 14, 15, is called "God's Angel," Exod. xxiii. 23; "the Angel in whom God had put His name," Exod. xxiii. 21; "the Angel," Acts vii. 35. 38; and, "the Angel of God's presence," Isa. lxiii. 9. These different appellations of the same Being shew plainly, that the Israelites did not take this Being that visibly appeared, to be God the Father,

that thus personated and represented the first, to have been the second Being, ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ, Phil. ii. 6.

I have already said, that this great Being either visibly residing with men, or appearing to them, was visible as a glory, or as a brightness in a cloud; either having the similitude of a man, or no shape and similitude at all. But it is now fit to be more particular, and to trace exactly these two different manners of this Being's becoming visible through the Scripture-history; which will make this whole matter evident and certain, beyond contradiction.

This great Being became visible, as a brightness or glory covered with a cloud, in the shape or similitude of a man, to our first parents, and to the patriarchs, both before and after the flood, Gen. iii. 8. iv. 14. 16. v. 24. vi. 13. viii. 21. xi. 5. xviii. 1—22. xxxii. 24—31; to Moses, Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of the children of Israel, Exod. xiv. 9—12; and to Moses when alone, after he

but the Jehovah Angel, or, second Person of the Trinity, who, as the manifested messenger of God, personated and represented Him. So Solomon afterwards understood it; for at the dedication of the temple, when the Glory filled the house, he says, "Behold, the heaven of heavens cannot contain Thee, how much less this house which I have built?" 1 Kings viii. 27.

became the leader of the children of Israel. This last particular will appear more fully hereafter.

Now that Jehovah God was visible to these persons, at these times, as a glory, or brightness, covered with a cloud, in the similitude or shape of a man, may be proved distinctly, by proving both parts of the proposition.

For, 1. "He became visible in the shape of a man." This is very evident in some of the places above-mentioned; particularly Gen. ii. 16—23, where God is said to speak to Adam and Eve, and to give them orders; and most expressly Gen. iii. 8, where they are said to "hear the voice of God, walking in the garden;" from whence He afterwards "drove out the man," ver. 23, 24, when, instead of walking with God, he had, from a consciousness of guilt, run away from Him, and hid himself, ver. 8. There were then placed, at the entrance of this garden, cherubims, and a glory, as the flame of a sword, pointing every way, to hinder his re-entrance. Jehovah God resided visibly at the entrance of this garden till the flood, and was surrounded with an host of angels; and God's being visible there is what is called "His face, and His presence," in Gen. iv. 14. 16. From God's fixed residence among men came the expressions of "coming to God,"

Heb. ii. 16, and of "coming, or drawing nigh to Him, of walking with Him," Exod. xxviii. 43. 1 Sam. xiv. 36. Gen. v. 22. 24. vi. 9, and "before Him," Gen. xvii. 1. xlviii. 15. 1 Kings ii. 48. To this presence of God good men brought or presented their offerings: from it mankind received marks of acceptance or displeasure, Gen. iv. 3—9. From thence too God talked with Cain, Gen. iv. 6—13. And from thence it was that, on murdering his brother, as from that part of the earth that had received his brother's blood, God banished him, ver. 14. 16, to a distant place; namely, to the land of Nod; which, in allusion to God's constant presence at the place where God spoke to him, and which I suppose was at the entrance of Eden, Cain calls being "hid from God's face," ver. 14. And Moses calls Cain's going away from this place, his going "out from the presence (or face) of God." It was this presence of God that "took Enoch" and put him into paradise, Gen. v. 24, and that "smelt a savour of rest (or a sweet savour) in Noah's offering;" shewing, that the smell of Noah's offering was grateful to Him, in some such way as that by which we shew a smell to be grateful to us; Gen. viii. 21. See a like phraseology, Lev. xxvi. 31. Amos v. 21. See also Eph. v. 2. Phil. iv. 18. It is in the same shape and form that "Jehovah came down," namely, from heaven, "to see the tower

of Babel," Gen. xi. 5, but with visible marks of wrath and displeasure.

And when, for the universal wickedness that overspread the world, God's presence seems to have been withdrawn soon after the flood; God yet is said, after a long interval, to appear at certain times; particularly, first to Abraham, who was the only worshipper of the true God, that had all along kept himself free from the general infection. And therefore it is that Stephen says, with a peculiar emphasis, that "the God of glory appeared to Abraham," Acts vii. 2; implying, that such an appearance had been unusual, at least for a considerable time, and that it was now only occasional. Jehovah and the two angels sat down and did eat with Abraham, Gen. xvii. 1—9. And when Jehovah had left communing with Abraham, "He went His way; and, as it should seem, towards Sodom, to see whether they had done according to the cry of it, which had come unto Him, ver. 21. God likewise appeared unto Isaac, Gen. xxvi. 2—6. And Jacob struggled to hold the Man that appeared to him, and would not let Him go till He had blessed him; which Man was God, Gen. xxxii. 24—31; that is, the Being that represented and personated the Almighty Father. Job says to God, after He had spoken to him, ch. xxxviii. 1, "I have heard of Thee by the hearing of the ear, but now hath mine eye

seen Thee," chap. xlii. 5. "Moses, Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of the children of Israel, saw Jehovah, the God of Israel, and there was under His feet as it were a paved work of sapphire-stone," Exod. xxiv. 5—12. Jehovah God did not only speak to Moses (ἐν εἴδει, according to the LXX) by an appearance; and Moses did not only see Jehovah, and "behold His similitude" (or the similitude of a man in which He appeared); but "God spake with him;" and that not only "face to face" (which sometimes indeed is taken figuratively; for speaking plainly, and not darkly and ænigmatically; as Deut. v. 4); but also "mouth to mouth" (which is never taken figuratively), Exod. xxxii. 7, and Numb. xii. 8, according to the LXX. And that the phrase, "face to face," is not taken figuratively, with regard to Moses, any more than the phrase, "mouth to mouth," is plain from hence, that God spake the ten words to the children of Israel, "face to face," that is, "plainly," Deut. v. 4; and yet, God spake to Moses "face to face," as well as "mouth to mouth," in such a manner, as He did not speak to the children of Israel; or to any of the prophets that were His contemporaries, as is plain from Numb. xii. 6—9. Finally, perhaps it is from Jehovah God's becoming visible, in an human shape, that we may best understand the import of those words, "Let us

make man in our own image, after our likeness," Gen. i. 26, taking them for the words of the second Being, representing and personating the first, and speaking to some of the angels, " His fellows," as they are called, Heb. i. 9.

Now, what can describe a human shape, in historical books, more than a presence or an appearance, that has a face, eyes, nostrils, mouth, breath, hinder parts (as we shall see presently) and feet? that expresses anger and favour with his looks? that is, sometimes speaking, sometimes silent; sometimes eating, sometimes smelling; sometimes approaching, sometimes going away; sometimes coming down, sometimes going up; sometimes standing, sometimes sitting; sometimes walking, sometimes struggling. In a word, what, besides an appearance in a human shape, can we understand by the "similitude of Jehovah," which Moses beheld, different from the glory which all the children of Israel beheld? We must always understand passages of the Bible, that ascribe passions personally to the Supreme Being, ἀνθρωποπάθως; because the Supreme Being has no passions. And therefore these passages must necessarily be understood of the second Being, as representing and personating the first; and on that account going by the name of the first. And,

2. As Jehovah resided or appeared, on these occasions, in a human shape; so that human

shape was a body of glory, covered with a cloud. From hence we may understand, how the glory sometimes mildly and benignly shone forth through the cloud, as a mark of favour to good men, like smiling in the countenance of a man; and that it did so, appears from the phrases that are so common in the Old Testament; as, "God's shining," Psal. l. 2; or, "shining forth," Psal. lxxx. 1; or, "causing His face to shine," Psal. iii. 16. lxviii. 1. lxxx. 3. 7. 19. cxix. 135; and, "lifting up the light of His countenance," Numb. vi. 16. Psal. iv. 6. xi. 4, which are all evidently derived from a glory, covered with a cloud, in the form and shape of a human face; and are taken from this form of God's becoming visible: though they are used in a period when that was not the usual form in which He became visible to men.

On these occasions the glory shone benignly through the cloud: whereas, if the cloud had been totally withdrawn, the glory would have utterly consumed them, and scorched them up; so that "no man could see the face of God (with the cloud totally withdrawn), and live." This may serve to explain what Moses means, Exod. xxxii. 18, when he "beseeches God to shew him His glory;" though God was at that very time speaking to Moses face to face, and mouth to mouth, as a man speaketh with his friend; and though Moses then beheld His "ap-

pearance and His similitude" (according to Numb. xii. 8), and the cloudy pillar was at the door of his tent: when Moses, in such circumstances as these, beseeches God to shew him His glory, he must mean His glory, κατ' ἐξοχήν, that is, the glory of His face; which must be supposed the brightest glory of that appearance, as the human face is the brightest part of a man. That that was what Moses meant, farther appears by God's answer; "No man can see my face and live," ver. 20. And, I think, the whole meaning of this prayer plainly is, that Moses desired to see the face of the appearance of God, with the cloud wholly withdrawn; for through the cloud he then beheld it. This Moses desired, as a sure token that God Himself would lead them to Canaan; notwithstanding the great provocation of the golden calf. This also will shew the meaning of God's answer; "Thou canst not see my face (that is, with the cloud totally withdrawn, unless thou art sheltered otherwise from it) and live." For, as God adds, "No man can (so) see my face, and live," ver. 20. But therefore, whilst my face, or brightest glory, passes by, I will place thee in the cleft of the rock, and will cover thee with my hand; which may preserve thee as much as the cloud itself: and when my face is passed by thee, I will take away my hand, and let thee see my back parts, in the

manner thou desirest; namely, not only with the cloud withdrawn, but with my hand removed also; for the brightness and flame there is not such as will consume thee, though the cloud be withdrawn, and my hand be likewise taken away. "But my face shall not be seen" (that is, shall not be seen with my hand withdrawn), lest the flame should utterly consume and scorch thee up.

From this body of glory's being covered with a cloud, also comes the phrase of God's "hiding His face," Job xiii. 24. Psal. xiii. 1. xxvii. 9. xxx. 7. lxix. 17. Isa. liv. 8, when, as Job says of the heavens, "He holdeth back the face of His throne, and spreadeth His cloud upon it," Job xxvi. 9. It is probable, that, on this occasion, the cloud, that covered His face, was so condensed, as that the light did not break through it at all. This, perhaps, may be the properest place to observe, that, probably, on some occasions, the cloud that covered the glory in a human shape, was so condensed all over the human shape, that Jehovah appeared entirely like a man: at least, it seems to have been so, in the case of God's appearing to Abraham, in the plains or oaks of Mamre; since Abraham seems, at the first, to have taken Him for a mere man, Gen. xviii. 1—17. And so it was in the case of Jacob, Gen. xxxii. 24. 30. From hence also comes the phrase of "intreat-

ing God's face," Psal. cxix. 58, as also of "God's being angry," Numb. xii. 9, when there were visible marks of displeasure in His countenance. From hence also, it may be, comes the phrase, which we meet with in numberless texts, of "seeking the Lord, and seeking His face" (namely, when He disappeared), and of "seeking to His habitation." See Job xxiii. 3—11.

On the other hand, as the glory often shone mildly from the face of God on good men; so it is probable it did, in particular, from one part of His face on them, when they were offering their sacrifices: while a flame broke out through the cloud to devour their sacrifice, as a mark that their gift was accepted. So it was on the first sacrifice that Aaron offered, Lev. ix. 24. See also Judges xiii. 20. 23. 1 Kings xviii. 36—40. Psal. xx. 3. But at other times the flame broke out from the presence, appearance, face, or glory of Jehovah, and probably from His "mouth or nostrils" (as Psal. xviii. 8), to burn, consume, and devour the wicked "with fire," as the Scripture literally expresses it,[1] Lev. x. 2.

[1] These expressions, as I observed before, were taken from God's having been visible in a human shape; that having been the first manner of His becoming visible, and having lasted near 2000 years; though He was not visible in that form when these expressions were used, unless it was to Moses.

Numb. xi. 1—14. xxxv. 16. 41—47. See Psal. l. 3. lxxxix. 46. xciv. 1, according to the marginal rendering; and then it was called "wrath," and sometimes "wrath that waxed hot," Exod. xxxii. 10, 11, and "the kindled anger of the Lord," Numb. xi. 2. xii. 2. It is probable, in allusion to this flame's breaking forth from "Jehovah's mouth," that Isaiah says, chap. xi. 4, that "the Branch will slay the wicked with the breath of His mouth;" and that St. Paul says, "That Christ will consume the man of sin with the breath of His mouth, and destroy him with the brightness of His appearing," 2 Thess. ii. 8. And we are told the very manner how He shall consume him, Rev. xix. 15. 20. This is called "the wrath of the Lamb," Rev. vi. 16. And, because a flame might thus easily have burst through the cloud, to devour those good men, to whom God appeared at any time; as it always did to devour their sacrifice, and as it sometimes did to consume the wicked; hence, I say, it is that Jacob breaks out into admiration, that he had seen the face of God, and yet that his "life was pre-

It is observable, that when God appeared to any of the later prophets in vision, it was in the like similitude as He had appeared to the antediluvian and postdiluvian patriarchs, &c. See Isa. vi. 1—9. Ezek. i. 26. Dan. x. 5, 6. 16. 18. Rev. i. 12—23. See also Joseph. Antiq. lib. x. chap. 12, who says, that "Daniel had familiar converse with God."

served," Gen. xxxii. 30. See also Judges vi. 21—25. xiii. 6. 22. Nor was the high-priest, under the times of the law, to come before the cloud of glory on the mercy-seat, but at set times, and with appointed preparations; particularly with making a cloud of incense before it, on pain of being consumed; see Lev. xvi. 2, and Deut. v. 25; which might well be the occasion of the fear which the high-priests had upon them when they were to enter the holy of holies. From hence it is, that God is said to be "a consuming fire," Deut. iv. 24. Heb. xii. ult.

II. As God was visible to our first parents, to the patriarchs, to Moses, Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of the children of Israel; and to Moses, when alone, after he became the leader of the children of Israel, in a glory covered with a cloud, in a human shape; so the appearance of God to Moses in the bush, and to the whole Israelitish nation, was a glory covered with a cloud, without any human shape or similitude at all. See Exod. xix. 9. 18, and compare it with Numb. xii. 8. This is what is called, "the glory of the Lord;" and when this appeared, it is generally said, that "the glory of the Lord appeared." The reason why this form, in which God became visible to the whole Israelitish nation, was so different from what it had been in the state of innocence, and the patriarchal times, and from

what it was to Moses when alone now, and to some few others, as Moses, Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and the seventy elders, and to some prophets afterwards in vision, on particular occasions, was this, to prevent the Israelites from making graven images; which they would have been much more prone to have done, if they had seen any likeness or similitude, which they could have represented by some image, picture, or the like. See Deut. iv. 12—16.

This glory in a cloud, without any shape or similitude, conducted the children of Israel out of Egypt, through the wilderness: it appeared brighter, and like fire, on the top of the mountain, at the giving of the law, when "Jehovah came unto them," Exod. xix. 9. 18. Deut. iv. 12, and xxiv. 16. John i. 11. It then fixed on Moses's tent, Exod. xxxiii. 7—12, and afterwards on God's tent or tabernacle (namely, as soon as it was finished, Exod. xi. 34—38), when God, who had at the first had His presence and residence among men, but who seems, soon after the flood, to have withdrawn Himself from the world for their idolatry; appearing, however, at certain times, to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in a human shape; and to Moses at the bush; and to the children of Israel, as a glory over their heads; came at last again in that glory, according to His promise, Exod. xxix. 43. 46, "to dwell among them;" whence the glory was afterwards called "the Shechi-

nah,"[1] by the Jewish writers, or the habitation of the Divine Majesty among the Israelites, from the word *Shachan*, which God uses on that occasion: the glory residing or dwelling in the holy of holies, "on the mercy-seat between the cherubims," Exod. xxv. 17—23. 1 Sam. iv. 4. 2 Sam. vi. 2. Psal. lxxx. 1. xcix. 1, as on the throne of the "King of Israel," till He seems to have departed, from the captivity of the ark, 1 Sam. iv. 21, 22. Psal. lxxviii. 60, to its returning to Kirjathjearim,[2] 1 Sam. vii. 1, and till at last He totally withdrew at the destruction of the temple. See Hosea v. 6, and Ezek. x. 1. 4. 18, 19. xi. 22, 23, as He had done for some time on other occasions; particularly 1 Sam. iv. 21, 22. Psal. lxviii. 60. Numb. xii. 9, after which this glorious Being tabernacled no more with men, nor made any visible appearance at all, till He "took flesh." All this is exactly agreeable to the history St. John gives

[1] "Shechinah."—As the Rabbinical writers call this glory "the Shechinah," after it dwelt among the Israelites, between the cherubims, and purely for that reason; so the Being that appeared to the antediluvian patriarchs may, for the same reason, be properly enough called "the Shechinah," because it dwelt among them.

[2] "To Kirjathjearim."—I suppose the glory to have returned at that time, because not long after we find David "enquiring of the Lord," 1 Sam. xxiii. 2—5, which enquiry was made by the priest presenting himself before the Lord, or the glory of the Lord, between the cherubims; and receiving an answer from it.

us of Him; for he says, "in the beginning was the Word—And He (the Word) was in the world, and the world was made by Him, and the world knew Him not. He came unto His own (people, the Israelites), and His own received Him not. And He took flesh, and tabernacled among us" (Jews), John i. 1. 10, 11. 14. "And," as he adds, "we (that is, he and two other of his fellow-apostles) beheld His glory (namely, on the mount of transfiguration) as the glory of the only-begotten Son of God" (that is, a glory becoming this new and high character of the only-begotten Son of God). For the glory on the mount was very bright, and without any cloud to cover it (as there had been in all His appearances before He took flesh); His face now shining as the sun, and His raiment being white as the light, Matth. xvii. 2.

After tabernacling thus with the Jewish nation in flesh a short time, He ascended up into heaven in a body of glory; from whence He called to Saul in the way to Damascus; darting a ray of light and glory on him to his conversion; and from whence He will be revealed again from heaven in a far brighter manner, to call and convert the Jews, after Saul's example,[1]

[1] See Jortin's remarks on Eccles. Hist. vol. ii. p. 14. Mede's Works, b. v. p. 891 and 768. "Arrangement of the New Test." vol. ii. p. 93. 2d Edit.

1 Tim. i. 16, and to destroy "the man of sin by the brightness of His appearance;" kindling the lake of fire and brimstone by the "breath of His mouth;" into which "the beast and the false prophet are first to be cast alive," Dan. vii. 12. Rev. xix. 20; and into which the devil and his angels are also to be cast in like manner; and in which also all the wicked are to have their portion, ver. 15; namely, "an everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord," 1 Thess. i. 9 (and which is the ὀργὴ, κρίμα, κατάκριμα, of the New Testament); whilst the righteous are to have their inheritance; first with Him here on the new earth, or the paradisaical and heavenly Canaan, for a thousand years, when God will "dwell or tabernacle again with men," and the glory of the Lord will shine bright in the New Jerusalem, Rev. xxi. 3, and finally, in this glory which the Word had with the Most High God before the foundations of the world. Thus will He be revealed again from heaven in flaming fire, to the salvation of His people, by destroying and burning up all their enemies; and by instating them in the possession of their unalienable felicity, to behold the brightest glory of God, which is His throne, and figuratively called His presence and face, as the face of their Father (the face being the most glorious appearance of a man): they themselves shining forth as sons of the resurrec-

tion, in bodies of glory, after the fashion of His most glorious body, "like the firmament itself, and like the sun for ever and ever."

To recapitulate briefly what I have said of this great Being's becoming visible, who represented and personated the first; and to put it in one short view, that it may be seen the more distinctly, it will stand thus: He resided in the world from the creation of man till after the flood; and the form in which He became visible in that period, was then called His Face, to denote the manner of His being visible; and His Presence, to denote His constant residence among mankind. He then withdrew for the incorrigible wickedness of the world; but became visible at certain times; namely, to disperse the builders of Babel; and to give tokens of His favour, and discoveries of His will to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; to Moses, Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of the children of Israel; and to Moses when alone, after he became the leader of that people. His visible form, in this period, was called His Appearance, to denote His being visible to a few, and but now and then. Whenever He either thus resided with mankind, or appeared thus to a few extraordinary persons, on some great occasions, it was in a glory resembling a human shape, but covered with a cloud. But after

withdrawing His presence from the world, and after appearing now and then to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Moses, Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of the children of Israel together; and to Moses, when alone, after He became the leader of the children of Israel; He then, according to His promise, came and dwelt among the children of Israel, between the cherubims; and was therefore called "the Shechinah," or "the dwelling," that is, "of God with the children of Israel." But He then appeared as a glory in a cloud, without any shape or similitude at all. At the ark's being taken by the Philistines, the glory departed, but returned at Kirjathjearim; but at the destruction of the first temple, this glory retired; and this great Being hid Himself; dwelling no more among men, till He tabernacled in flesh among the Jews, about six hundred years after the destruction of the first temple. After dwelling thus among the Jews as a prophet, and consequently as a private man, a few years, He ascended up into heaven in a body of glory, and there sat down at God's right-hand, as a King in His own right, and attended with His own glory; where He is to remain in the same character and glory, till He shall come again in them to dwell a thousand years, by a bright ray of His glory, in the New Jerusalem, that cometh down from heaven on the new

earth, after that the "old shall be passed away;" at the end of which He is to deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father, "that God may be all in all," 1 Cor. xv. 24. 28.

From this account of God's becoming visible to men, we may draw the following corollaries:—

I. God's becoming visible in a glory, covered with a cloud, in a human shape, will explain to us, how destroying the sacrifice by fire came to be a mark that the gift or the sacrifice was accepted; since, as the fire came forth from Jehovah to consume the sacrifice; and probably from His mouth, when He visibly resided in a human shape; it was, as it were, His eating or devouring the sacrifice. They used to light lamps to preserve this sacred fire, and called them *orim asda*, lights of grace: and it is in allusion to God's devouring the sacrifice, that the putting an end to idolatry is expressed "by Jehovah's famishing all the gods of the heathen," through their former votaries not offering them any more sacrifices, Zeph. ii. 11, which the false gods, in imitation of the true God, were supposed, by the vulgar, to devour; through the delusion of the priests, who privately devoured the sacrifices for them, if any kind of credit may be given to the history of Bel and the Dragon.

II. God's becoming visible thus as a glory, or brightness in a cloud, may furnish us with a very probable account of the rise of the worship of fire; a worship that was so ancient and prevailing among the eastern nations, particularly the Persians, under Zoroaster, whose religion was in so great a part copied from the Mosaic history and institutions. See Quint. Curt. l. iv.; who says, that "Darius called upon the sacred and eternal fire."

III. From hence we may, perhaps, account, why sacrifices were offered from the fall till a little after the flood; and why they were then left off (by Abraham, Isaac and Jacob) till they were appointed again by Moses.

In order to this, I must first establish the fact, it not being generally allowed, and then endeavour to account for it; and, 1. I must establish the fact, and prove, that sacrifices were used, and disused, in the periods I have assigned. I observe, that Moses expressly says, that "Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an *offering* unto Jehovah;" and that "Abel also brought (an offering) of the firstlings of his flock, and of the fat thereof," Gen. iv. 4, which, in Moses's phrase, is sacrificing them. And he says yet more expressly, in the case of Noah, that he builded an *altar* unto Jehovah; and tells us for what purpose; namely, that he took

of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt-offerings unto Jehovah, Gen. viii. 20. Now from this time, to the time of the children of Israel's going out of Egypt, Moses never mentions the offering a sacrifice unto God, unless it be in the extraordinary case of Abraham's going to offer up Isaac; when, being forbidden to do it, and lifting up his eyes to the angel that called to him, he saw a ram caught in the thicket, and offered him up for a burnt-offering in the stead of his son. This case is so extraordinary, in all its circumstances, that nobody can argue from hence, that sacrifices were Abraham's ordinary way of worship: that it was neither his ordinary way of worship, nor that of Isaac, or Jacob, or his twelve sons, may be well argued from Moses's silence about it, in all other cases, from the xiith chapter of Genesis to the end of that book. But that is not all; for Moses informs us, that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob built altars on some great occasions, as Gen. xii. 7, 8. xiii. 18. xxiv. 24. xxviii. 18. xxxv. 1. 3. 9. 14. And yet Moses never says, they built them to offer sacrifices on; or that they actually did offer sacrifices on them. Why should so accurate an historian as Moses, after saying, that "Noah builded an altar unto Jehovah," and that he "offered burnt-offerings on the altar;" why, I say, should Moses not say the same in the case of Abraham, Isaac

and Jacob, if they had offered sacrifices on the altars they built; which yet is evident he does not mention in the places just now quoted? But neither is this yet all; for after saying in all those places, that those patriarchs built altars, he adds, and they "called on the name of the Lord," or Jehovah; which is not a phrase used by Moses as equivalent to offering sacrifices, or by any other of the sacred writers: nor is it at all reasonable to imagine it should. Moses says, Gen. viii. 20, that "Noah builded an altar, and offered burnt-offerings on it." And so he says of Abraham, Gen. xxii. 13; namely, that after he had built the altar, ver 9, "he offered the ram for a burnt-offering instead of his son." Why then would Moses vary his phrase, concerning Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, when they are said to have built altars in the other places just now quoted? And why should he add, that they "called on the name of Jehovah," if that signified the same thing with offering a sacrifice? If prayer always accompanied the sacrifices of the antediluvian patriarchs, it would not follow, that sacrifices must always accompany prayer; besides, the phrase of "calling on the name of the Lord," signifies praying to the Lord; as we may see, 1 Kings xviii. 24. 2 Kings v. 11. 1 Chron. xvi. 8. Psal. cv. 1. cxvi. 17. Zeph. iii. 9.

But we may further argue, that Abraham,

Isaac and Jacob did not offer any sacrifice, at the times mentioned in the texts just now quoted, because they did not build the altars till after that God had appeared to them at that place, and was retired; whereas no offering was ever, in any instance, offered to Jehovah, but as "residing." So it was in the antediluvian state; and so it was under the law, since every sacrifice was to be offered to the Lord residing in the tabernacle, or in the temple; nor could they tell where to bring their offering, without knowing where He resided to whom the offering was to be brought; or know whether it was accepted, without seeing a fire come from that Being to devour it; as has been observed already. I must just repeat here, that the extraordinary cases of Abraham, David, and Elijah, must be excepted, though in the two last of these cases it is said, that Jehovah answered from "heaven by fire;" and that the "fire of Jehovah fell and consumed the sacrifice," 1 Chron. xxi. 26. 2 Kings xviii. 38. And there is no doubt but the like happened in Abraham's case also.

If it be said, what did they build altars for but to sacrifice on? I answer, as memorials of God's having appeared to them at that place, or making some gracious promise to them there; and therefore in Jacob's case they are called "pillars," Gen. xxviii. 18, and xxxv. 1. 3. 7. 14,

the design of which, as is well known, is to perpetuate the memory of that thing which they are set up for. This is confirmed from another observation; namely, that in these instances, and which are the only instances of the postdiluvian patriarchs building altars, except in the extraordinary instance of Abraham on his going to offer up Isaac, they are all built at the place where God appeared to them respectively, in the land of Canaan, or promised it to them for an inheritance, or to their seed after them; or make them some gracious vouchsafements in return to that land: so extraordinary a favour vouchsafed them in the land to which God had brought them, and which He had promised them for a temporal possession for their carnal seed in the fourth generation, and for an everlasting possession for themselves and their spiritual seed, in all their generations, at the times of the "restitution of all things," they thought it proper to perpetuate the memory of, by erecting pillars, for their own comfort and satisfaction, and for a memorial to future ages. It is highly probable too, that they built these pillars in a very different manner from the altars of the Canaanites; to shew them who saw these altars or pillars, that the God of whose appearance or presence they preserved the memory was not any of their dead heroes, or false gods, but Jehovah, the living and

the true God. The oil which Jacob poured on the pillar or altar that he built, Gen. xxviii. 18, and which he repeated with a drink-offering when he built it anew by God's order, Gen. xxxv. 14, was not designed as an offering, since no sacrifice accompanied it; but only to consecrate the pillar, and to devote it to the purpose for which he built it; namely, to preserve the remembrance of God's having appeared to him there.

But if it be farther objected, that Moses acquaints us, that "Jacob offered sacrifices on the mount," Gen. xxxi. 54, I answer, it ought only to have been rendered, as it is in the margin, that "Jacob killed beasts," namely, to feast his brethren. See Ainsworth, in loc.

Thus I have endeavoured to establish the fact; namely, that though sacrifices were the way by which the antediluvian patriarchs worshipped God; yet, that the pillars or altars that were built by the postdiluvian patriarchs were not used for sacrifice (unless in the extraordinary case of Abraham's offering the ram), but to strengthen their faith and hope, and the faith and hope of aftertimes, when they "called on the name of the Lord."

I shall now endeavour to account for this different way of worship of the postdiluvian from the antediluvian patriarchs, from what has been said; which I think may be done thus,

in a very natural manner. When the Logos, representing and personating the Supreme Being in a human shape, resided constantly in the world, as He did from the creation till some time after the flood, men brought an offering to Him; and He visibly accepted it, by devouring it by a flame proceeding from Himself; or rejected it by not devouring it: thus things were, in this infant state of the world, transacted in dumb show, both on God's part and on men's. But when the Logos, representing God, retired from the world, and appeared but now and then, for a very short season, and at uncertain times and places; as was the case from the calling of Abraham to the law; they could not tell where to build an altar, or bring God an offering: yet, however, to perpetuate the memory of so uncommon and extraordinary a vouchsafement, as His appearing to them, or making them some extraordinary promise, they built pillars to preserve the memory of them respectively; and there they offered up their public prayers and devotions to God, who had appeared to them by His representative, or made them some more than ordinary vouchsafement at that place, though now He did not appear to them there. This Moses very significantly expresses, by "calling on the name of Jehovah;" intimating, that He could hear them, though He did not by His representative appear to them. When God,

by Moses, appointed sacrifices to be offered to Him at the tabernacle, or the first temple, it was because he resided in those places as their king. And though sacrifices were offered in the second temple, where Jehovah did not reside, yet that temple was still considered as Jehovah's house, and into which, according to Malachi iii. 1, He was to come: "His kitchen in Sion therefore was still to be supplied, and His chimney was still to smoke in Jerusalem," Isa. xxxi. 9.

Coroll. IV. From hence also probably came all the heathen mythology, of Saturn's dwelling with men, and governing them himself, till, for their wickedness, he retired, and hid himself in an inaccessible retreat. This was the doctrine of Orpheus, and of Plato, in the dialogue which bears the title of Politicus. Hence also came the fables of Jupiter and other gods, coming down to visit men, sometimes in a human shape, and sometimes in a cloud; as likewise, the notion of the gods departing from any country or city devoted to destruction. See Macrob. Saturn. lib. iii. cap. 9, and Virgil's second Æneid,

Excessere omnes adytis arisque relictis
Dii, quibus imperium hoc steterat—

See also Pliny's Natural History, lib. xxviii. c. 2.

Coroll. V. The observations that have been made on God's becoming visible thus in a glory covered with a cloud may serve to confirm the truth of the Bible's being a revelation from God; since we find that there are traces quite through it of a great Being, who has, in several periods, visibly shone with a glory on good men; and broke out into a flame against the wicked, to consume them; and who will, at last, "be revealed in flaming fire," to the utter confusion and irretrievable destruction of all the enemies of God and goodness, and to the unspeakable joy and eternal salvation of the righteous.

This is cast through the whole of revelation, like a small thread that runs through the piece; and which, like other genuine marks of truth, while it escapes a sudden or slight glance, offers itself to a prying and curious eye, as a plain mark that all of it was wrought off in one and the same loom.

EXPOSITION

OF

1 PETER iii. 17—22.

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.
17 For it is better, if the will of God be so, that ye suffer for well-doing, rather than for evil-doing.	17. For if it be the will of God that ye should suffer death, it is infinitely better that you should suffer it for adhering to the doctrine and duties of Christianity, than as evildoers.
18 For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God: being put to death by His flesh, but quickened by His Spirit.	18. For if you should suffer death in the cause of the Christian religion, you would only be conformed to Christ; who suffered, and who suffered indeed for sins; but then it was as a just and righteous person, for the sake of the unjust; that so He might by His death and resurrection bring them to God. He died indeed while He was in the flesh,[1] for if He had not had a body of

[1] "Being put to death while he was in the flesh." So I think is to be understood θανατωθεὶ μὲν σαρκὶ, according to the sense I have given it in the Paraphrase.

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.
	flesh and blood, He had not been mortal; but then, being a perfectly righteous person, He was quickened by His own Spirit (the Logos).[1]
19 By which Spirit also He went and preached to those that were shut up in a prison.	19. By which Spirit, as He quickened and raised Himself out of His prison of the grave;[2] so He also,

[1] "But quickened by His Spirit:" ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι, as is the reading of the Alexandrian MS. and others; which omit the article before πνεύματι. And I think the sense confirms this reading; πνεύματι signifying His own spirit, and not the Holy Ghost; which is usually pointed out by the article. And that His own spirit is intended, is plain, by its being opposed to His flesh. This place of St. Peter is parallel to that of St. Paul, Rom. i. 3, 4: "Concerning His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David, according to the flesh; and proved to be the Son of God, according to a spirit of holiness (namely, His own, πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης, without the article), by the resurrection of the dead." Besides, it is nowhere said in Scripture that Christ was quickened or raised by the Holy Ghost, but always that He raised His own body: "Destroy this temple," says He, probably pointing to His own body, "and I will raise it again in three days," John ii. 19. "I lay it (my life) down of myself; I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again: this commandment have I received of my Father," John x. 18. "For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth whom he will; so the Son quickeneth whom He will," John v. 21. "And as the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given it to the Son to have life in Himself," ver. 26. Indeed all things of this kind are ascribed to the Spirit of Jesus. His own Spirit was that Holy Spirit that took the body God had prepared for him, that grew in wisdom and knowledge; and that gave up itself when He expired; and therefore, by the rules of analogy, is most likely to have been that Spirit that raised up His dead body from the grave.

[2] "Out of his prison of the grave." The grave seems to be represented in Scripture as a prison; see Hosea xiii. 14, Acts ii. 24; and therefore is said at the resurrection to give up, or deliver up, the dead which are in it, Rev. xx. 13. And Hades, that is, the receptacle of separate bodies and separate souls, is represented as having gates, Matth. xvi. 18. And Christ is said to have the keys of them, Rev. i. 18. Christ's rising out of His prison of the grave seems to have been the thought in St. Peter's mind, that led him to that other thought, of Christ's going to

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.
	going from the place where He had had His former fixed residence into the ark,[1] preached to those whom God had shut up in it as in a prison and safe custody.[2]
20 Which were some time disobedient, when, in the days of Noah, the long-suffering of God waited, while the ark was building; wherein few persons, that is,	20. I say, He going into the ark, preached unto those who were shut up in it; who, indeed, had been disobedient for a considerable time, even all the time

preach to those that were in the prison of the ark. I cannot see any connexion of St. Peter's thoughts here, if this be not it. And this suiting so well with the whole of this portion of Scripture, I think one may from thence safely conclude, that this is the sense of the passage.

[1] "Where He had His residence." What that place of His residence was which He left when He went into the ark.

[2] "He also (going into the ark) preached to those that were shut up in prison." Ἐν ᾧ καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ κατακεκλεισμένοις πνεύμασι πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν (not πνεύμασι, in the plural). That is the Vellesian reading, as *spiritu* is of several of the Latin versions: and indeed "preaching to spirits" is an expression that would be quite singular. But the sense is, that by the same Spirit by which He, going into His grave, quickened and raised Himself up from that prison, He also going (πορευθεὶς) from the place of His former residence into the ark, preached to those who were shut in it, as in a prison or safe custody, namely, by God, Gen. vii. 16. (κατακεκλεισμένοις.) That is the reading in one of Stephens' copies, in Dr. Covell's, and in one of Colbert's. The same word which the LXX had used of God's shutting up Noah in the ark (ἔκλεισε), Gen. vii. 16. They were shut up in the ark, as in a prison, or safe custody; for that is the proper notion of a prison. So we see Paul was put into the castle, to save him from the fury of the people, and preserve him for a legal trial, Acts xxiii. 10. And that the Logos, who all along represented Jehovah under the Old Testament, went into the ark, we learn from Moses saying, that Jehovah said to Noah, "Come thou into the ark;" and afterwards, "Go thou out of the ark;" though He could not have said either the one or the other, if He had not been there Himself; and to Him residing there, as representing and personating Jehovah, it is most probable that Noah brought his burnt-offering, as soon as he went out of the ark; and that God from thence smelt a savour of rest in his offering, and blessed him.

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.
eight, were saved by water.	that God waited with patience on the old world; which was while Noah was building the ark, wherein but a very few persons, namely, eight, were at last saved by water, after they became obedient, on His preaching to them[1] (as there are but few of the present disobedient world that will be saved from everlasting destruction).
21 To which baptism, as the antitype, also now saveth us (not the washing of the filth of the flesh; but the restipulation of a good	21. To which ark, saving these eight persons, by means of the water's bearing it up (without which it must have sunk in the mud

[1] "Which were some time disobedient, when in the days of Noah the long-suffering of God waited, while the ark was building." This is a description of the persons to whom He went and preached. The Greek is πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν, "He going, preached;" that is, He going from the place of His fixed residence, as has been just now observed, into the ark, preached, namely, to Noah's wife, his sons, and his sons' wives. For God says to Noah, "Come thou, and all thy house, into the ark: for thee have I seen righteous in this generation;" that is, thee alone, Gen. vii. 1. See also Gen. vi. 8, 9. 11, 12. His wife, therefore, his sons, and his sons' wives, must have been disobedient. The time of their disobedience is mentioned, namely, all the time that the long-suffering of God waited on the old world: or, which is the same thing, "all the while the ark was building." But God saved Noah's disobedient family for Noah's sake; as He would have saved Lot's wicked sons-in-law for his sake, Gen. xix. 14; and as he would have saved Sodom and Gomorrah for ten righteous men's sake, if they had been there, Gen. xviii. 32. And therefore it is said, "God shut him in," not "them," as the context otherwise would have required, Gen. vii. 16. See also ver. 13—16. For Noah's sake, God graciously gave them this opportunity to repent. Nor was it without effect: for Peter's saying, that "they were once disobedient," namely, "while the ark was building," plainly implies, that though they continued disobedient till they entered into the ark, yet that they became obedient, after that the Logos going into the ark preached unto them.

TEXT.

conscience) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

PARAPHRASE.

and mire, and have suffocated those that were in it); I say, to which ark, so saving them by the means of the water, as the original model, baptism, as the antitype, now saveth us:[1] not the being buried under water in baptism, which only signifies our death to sin; for that alone would only be a washing of our bodies from their filth; and would no more save us, than baptism would save a dead man, who might be put under water, and who dies to sin; but it is our rising up out of the water in baptism, that truly saveth us; signifying our rising again to newness of life; or our sincere and conscientious restipulation and engagement to walk in it: just as it was not so much the eight persons going into the ark, or the ark's going into the water, that saved them (for they would have been starved if they had staid there); as it was the

[1] "To which baptism, as the antitype, now saveth us." Τύπος is the original type, or model; ἀντίτυπον is the antitype, which resembles the original type or model, and bears a just proportion and analogy to it: so the "heavenly things" are implied to be the types (τύποι), and the earthly sanctuary is said to be the antitypes (ἀντίτυπα) "of the heavenly or the true;" that is, they were made after that model, Heb. ix. 23. So the model God showed Moses in the mount is said to be the τύπος, Heb. viii. 5; and consequently the tabernacle and its furniture were the ἀντίτυπα. In the same sense the gospel is said to be the body; and the law is said to be the shadow which that body casts.

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.
	ark's coming out of the water, and resting on the dry land, and their coming out of the ark. This was what truly saved them from perishing by the flood.[1] And that even our rising out of the water of baptism saveth us, is through the resurrection of Jesus Christ, who was quickened and raised out of His prison of the grave, by His own Spirit; as I told you before.
22 Who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels, and authorities, and powers, being made subject unto Him.	22. The consequence of which was, that He ascended up into heaven, and is there vested with all dominion;[2] all angels (whe-

[1] "That saved them from perishing by the flood." I hope I have represented the similitude and analogy, that baptism bears to the saving the eight persons in the ark from the flood, by means of the water, so fully in the Paraphrase, that I need not say any thing more to it here.

[2] "Vested with all dominion." St. Peter here represents our salvation to be brought about by Christ's death, as His resurrection was the consequence of His death; and as His ascension was the consequence of His resurrection. By which there is some farther analogy to baptism still hinted: for baptism saveth us, by putting us under water, signifying our death to sin, as the consequence of putting us so under water in baptism is our rising up out of the water; signifying our sincere engagement to live in newness of life; and the consequence of that will be our going up to heaven at last, where Christ is gone before to prepare a place for us; and whence He will come again to take us to Himself; which is the completing our salvation. And this is the plan of the salvation by Christ, as it is laid down in Scripture; especially when it represents the plan in the words that are the clearest, and freest of all figures of speech. Christ, in all lowliness and humility, became obedient to the death of the cross, for the glory of God, and the good of mankind. This was an act of obedience so acceptable to God, that God, by a power and commandment which He gave to Him, raised Him from the dead, in order to His ascending to heaven, and to His being seated at His own right hand, vested with all power, and having the highest

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

ther good or bad), authorities, and powers, being made subject unto him ;[1] so that you cannot fail of salvation by the resurrection of Jesus Christ, into a resemblance of whose resurrection you are baptized ; His resurrection having been followed by His ascension to all power : since, in virtue of it, the most powerful beings, who are friendly to you, voluntarily obey His orders, in ministering for your good; and those powerful beings, who would oppose it, are made subject to His command.

interest with Him who vested Him with it. So Rom. viii. 34; "Who is He that condemneth? It is Christ that died; yea, rather, that is risen again, and who is even at the right hand of God, and who maketh intercession for us." All is here wound up in Christ's being at the right hand of God, and in making intercession for us; that is, in His having all power conferred on Him, and a right to be heard by Him to whom alone all power originally belongs, in virtue of His obedience : the highest and last act of which was His death on the cross. And thus we are said to be saved by "the blood of Christ," because it is by His own blood that He has entered the heavens as a royal priest, and as a priestly king.

[1] "Angels (whether good or bad), authorities, and powers, being made subject unto Him ;" namely, as a royal priest, or a priestly king. Angels, authorities, and powers, are the names by which the different degrees of dominion or rank of these invisible beings are expressed in Scripture. But that is not so material : it is more to our purpose to take notice, that by "angels," not only "good angels" are meant, who are made assistant and subservient to the heirs of salvation, for their benefit and advantage; but the "evil angels" also, who are adversaries to them ; for which, see Rom. viii. 38, 39. 1 Cor. vi. 3. Gal. i. 8.

AN EXPOSITION

OF

Several Portions of the Book of Genesis, relating to Part of the History of Abraham; particularly to the Promises which God made him.

SECTION I.—Chap. xii. 1—8.

THE CONTENTS.

The God of glory appears to Abram, to call him out of Ur of the Chaldees, in the country of Mesopotamia, in expectation of the performance of a promise, which God then made him there. Abram leaves Ur and comes to Charan, another town of Chaldea, nearer to Canaan, together with Terah his father, Sarai his wife, Lot his nephew, &c. On Terah's death at Charan, Abram leaves Charan, and comes to Sichem, in the land of Canaan. There God appears to him again; and, ver. 7, opens a branch of the general promise made him in Ur, as it is recorded, ver. 1—4; namely, that in some future

time He will make a grant of the land of Canaan unto his seed. Abram builds an altar or pillar there, and calls on the name of Jehovah.

Year of Abram's age.	Place of the transaction.	PARAPHRASE.	TEXT.
70.	Ur a city or place of the Chaldees in Mesopotamia.	1. Now during the time that Abram dwelt in Ur of the Chaldees, before he came to Charan, Jehovah (that is, the great Being who personated and represented him), who had retired from the world soon after the flood, for the wickedness of men, appeared to him,[1] and said, "Leave this thy country, where thou hast possessions, and thy kindred; leave them all, even the nearest of them, that will not go with thee;[2] they being all infected with idolatry, and thou thyself the only man free from it;[3] and go to a land that I will shew thee.	1 Now Jehovah had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee.
		2. And, to encourage thee so to do, I promise thee, that I will make thee so fruitful, as that a nation shall	2 And I will make of thee a great nation; and I will bless thee, and make thy

[1] Ver 1. "Jehovah appeared." See Acts vii. 2; that is, "the great Being who represented and personated Jehovah;" namely, the Supreme Being; and who spake not from Him, as all other messengers do; but as Him, or in His name.

[2] See Acts vii. 3. Gen. xi. 31.

[3] See Josh. xxiv. 2. Nehem. ix. 7, 8. Joseph. Antiq. l. i. Maim. in Misn. Treat. of Idol. c. xi. 1—4.

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.	Year of Abram's age.	Place of the transaction.
name great, and thou shalt be a blessing.	come from thee, though Sarai thy wife be as yet barren;[1] and I will moreover bless thee in other respects; for I will make thy name great, and I will make thee a man highly useful and beneficial to many.	70.	
3 And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and all families of the earth shall be blessed in thee.	3. And besides the advantage they may have immediately from thee, I will otherwise, in the course of my providence, bless all those that shall bless and assist thee; and I will curse all those, in the course of my providence, that shall curse and disturb thee: and moreover, what I chiefly and finally promise thee, is, that all the families of the earth, even the most accursed, that shall imitate thee, shall be blessed in and through thee.[2] The particulars contained in the two great		

[1] Ver. 2. See Gen. xi. 30.

[2] Ver. 2, 3. "And I will make of thee a great nation; and all the families of the earth shall be blessed in thee." There seem to be two parts of this promise, ver. 2, 3, the first relating to Abram and his family; the second to all the families of the earth without distinction. The first, relating to Abram and his family, has several branches; as, that God would make Abraham a great nation, would give him great reputation and renown; would make him beneficial and useful to others; would in His providence favour Abraham's friends, and frown on his enemies. And secondly, a promise made of blessing all the families of the earth (all without distinction, even the most accursed) in or through Abram. What particulars were comprehended under these two great branches of this general promise, will be distinctly opened in the sequel of the history.

Year of Abram's age.	Place of the transaction.	PARAPHRASE.	TEXT.
70.		branches of this general promise, I reserve to be opened to thee, from time to time, for thy farther support and encouragement, when thou shalt arrive at the land that I will shew thee."	
		4. And as Abram had left Ur in obedience to God's command, and on the encouragement of this general promise, and	4 So Abram departed as Jehovah had spoken to him; and Lot went with him. And Abram was seventy-five years old when he departed out of Charan.
	Charan in Chaldea.	was got as far as Charan in his way thither, but had staid at Charan for some years, on account of his father Terah's great age and infirmities, Terah being about two hundred years old when he left Ur; so now he dying there,[1] Abram pursued his journey,	
75.		when he was seventy-five years of age, and came to Sichem.	
	Sichem, or the Oaks of Moreh in Canaan.	5. Unto the Oaks of Moreh, with Sarai his wife, and Lot his nephew;[2] and with all the substance that God had blessed them with in Charan; and with all the souls that Lot, or any of Abram or	5 And Abram took Sarai his wife, and Lot his brother's son, and all their substance that they had gathered, and the souls that they had gotten

[1] Ver. 4. "Terah dying there." See Gen. xi. 32. Acts vii. 4.

[2] Ver. 5. "Sarai and Lot." It should seem as if Nahor, Abraham's brother, came with him to Charan or Padanaram, but did not leave it with Abram; he and his family seem to have settled there. It seems to have been called Nahor's city, Gen. xxv. 20. xxiv. 10. 15. xxviii. 2. 10. And this place Abram called his city and kindred, Gen. xxiv. 4.

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.	Year of Abram's age.	Place of the transaction.
in Charan. And they went forth to go into the land of Canaan; and into the land of Canaan they came.	Lot's servants had gotten in Charan.	75.	
6 And Abram passed through the land unto the place of Sichem, unto the oaks of Moreh.	6. And as the Canaanites, the inhabitants of the land, were an idolatrous and barbarous people,		
7 And Jehovah appeared unto Abram and said, Unto thy seed will I give this land. And there builded he an altar unto Jehovah, who appeared unto him.	7. Jehovah, to support and encourage Abram in the place to which he had brought him, now appeared to him again, by the great Being that represented and personated Him, and opened another particular contained in the two great branches of the general promise, ver. 1—4; namely, "That as a reward of his faith and obedience in coming thither, and as an encouragement to persevere in his fidelity, He now acquainted him, that He would in some future time make a grant of the land (to which he was now come) unto his seed."[1] Whereupon		

[1] Ver. 7. "Unto thy seed." This promise, of making a grant of the land in some future time unto Abraham's seed, was a particular promise, in virtue of the first branch of the general promise, Gen. xii. 2, and part of the third verse.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

Year of Abram's age. 75. Place of the transaction.

Abram, to strengthen his own faith and hope in future times, and the faith and hope of his posterity, built an altar or pillar,[1] to preserve the memory of so gracious an appearance and promise, and to offer up his public devotions there, as long as he should continue in that neighbourhood.

SECTION II.—Chap. xiii. 14—19.

THE CONTENTS.

After Abram had parted with his nephew Lot in a very kind and condescending manner, Jehovah farther opens to him the general promise that is recorded, chap. xii. 1—4, by showing him all the land of Canaan in vision; and promising to grant it, in some future time, to his seed, through him; so as that he should be the original grantee. Abram builds there also an altar or pillar unto Jehovah.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

Year of Abram's age. 75. Place of the transaction. Bethel in Canaan.

14. After that Abram had been under the hard necessity of separating from Lot (the only relation, besides his wife, that came with him to

14 And Jehovah said unto Abraham, after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now

[1] "An altar." This was not an altar to offer sacrifices on; but an altar or pillar of remembrance. See Gen. xxxv. 3. 7. 14, xxxviii. 18, and the Dissert. No. II. Coroll. III.

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.	Year of Abram's age.	Place of the transaction.
thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art, northward and southward, and eastward, and westward:	this barbarous and idolatrous country), by which they were both the more exposed; and that Abram had separated from him, in the kind and condescending manner that is related in the former part of this chapter; Jehovah said unto Abram in a vision,[1] in farther explication of the first branch of the general promise, that is related chap. xii. ver. 1—4;	75.	Bethel in Canaan.
15 For all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever.	15. "Look all round thee, and take a view of the land. For as I said, chap. xii. ver. 7, that I would in some future time make a grant of		

[1] Ver. 14. "And Jehovah said unto Abram." I apprehend that this was said in a vision; as chap. xv. ver. 1. I apprehend so for two reasons; first, Because it is not said, that "Jehovah appeared," as it is, chap. xii. 7. xvii. 1. xviii. 1, and which, I think, is too material a circumstance to have been omitted, considering how great a vouchsafement it must have been deemed, for God to have appeared, after He had so long retired from the world. Indeed it is not said, chap. xii. 1, that God appeared to Abram in Ur of the Chaldees, though Stephen tells us he did, Acts vii. 2. But then one cannot but observe, that the account of what God said to Abram in Ur of the Chaldees, is not given in the place it holds in the history, or at the time when Abram went out of Ur, but five years after, when he left Charan, only in order to give the reason why he left Charan on Terah's death, and went to Canaan. And therefore it is said, "now Jehovah had said unto Abram," &c. Secondly, Because if this had not passed in a vision, Abram could not have seen much of the land; whereas God promises, that He will grant unto him all the land that he saw, ver. 15. What his eyes out of vision could have reached, would have been a very inconsiderable part of what was intended him, namely, a great tract of country from Nile to Euphrates; as we may see, chap. xv. ver. 18.

Year of Abram's age.	Place of the transaction.	PARAPHRASE.	TEXT.
75.	Bethel in Canaan.	this land unto thy seed; so now I farther tell thee, that I will in some future time make an original grant of this land unto thee; and unto thy carnal seed (not as the original grantees; but as grantees) after, or through thee;[1] and I will grant it after this manner unto thee, and unto thy carnal seed for ever.[2]	
		16. And I will make thy carnal seed as numerous as the dust of the earth, so that the one shall be no more capable of being numbered than the other.	16 And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth: so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered.
		17. Arise in the faith of this my promise,	17 Arise, walk through the land,

[1] Ver. 15. "To thee will I give it, and to thy seed after thee." That is, I will give it to thee, and to thy seed through thee; q. d. before, (viz. chap. xii. ver. 7.) I only said that I would grant Canaan to thy seed; by my saying so, thou mightest then perhaps think, that I promised to make the original grant to thy seed. Now I tell thee, that was not my intention; but that in some future time I will make thee the original grantee (see Ezek. xxxiii. 24.); and thy seed shall only take after, or through thee, and not as original grantees. See 2 Chron. xx. 7. I will let them see in all after generations, that they enjoy it, not for their own sakes, but for thine. See Gen. xxvi. 24. xxviii. 4. Exod. vi. 4, 5. 8. xxxiii. 1. Deut. i. 8. iv. 37. vii. 7, 8. ix. 5. x. 15. xi. 21. xxx. 20. 2 Chron. xx. 7. Psal. cv. 42.

[2] "For ever." That is, in perpetuity, or for a very long duration; or, as we now say, to a man and his heirs for ever; that is, to the world's end, if there be no act to alter it; as sale, forfeiture, &c.

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.	Year of Abram's age.	Place of the transaction.
in the length of it, and in the breadth of it; for I will give it unto thee.	and make a perambulation through the land; that thou mayest see what it is that I will one day grant unto thee, and unto thy seed (after, or through thee) for ever! And I will protect thee from the danger that thy perambulation may expose thee to."	75.	Bethel in Canaan.
18 Then Abram removed his tent, and came and dwelt in the oaks of Mamre, which is in Hebron, and built there an altar unto Jehovah.	18 Then Abraham removed his tent, and at the end of his perambulation came and pitched it in the grove of oaks of Mamre; and in thankful remembrance of God's making him this second promise, since he came into Canaan; and, of the protection He had vouchsafed him in his journey through the land, built there an altar or pillar unto Jehovah, as he had done on God's appearance and promise at Sichem; and performed his public devotions there while he continued in its neighbourhood.		Grove of Oaks in Mamre, in Hebron, in Canaan.

SECTION III.—Chap. xv.

THE CONTENTS.

After Abram had rescued Lot from the captivity of the four kings, the word of Jehovah

came to Abram in a vision, and acquainted him, that he should have a numerous seed, not by an adopted son, Eliezer of Damascus, his present steward, but by a son of his own body; and should have a right of inheritance to Canaan, to transmit to his seed, by that son; and that his seed should have the possession of it in the fourth generation. God also made a covenant with him, whereby He then granted to Abram the inheritance of all the land of Canaan, from Nile to Euphrates; and the possession of it to his seed by a son of his own body, in the fourth generation.

Year of Abram's age.	Place of the transaction.	PARAPHRASE.	TEXT.
75.		1. After Abram had rescued Lot from the captivity of the four kings, in the former chapter, the word of Jehovah came unto Abram in a vision,[1] saying, "Fear not, Abram, I am thy shield to protect thee: I will continue to preserve thee from all harm and danger, as I have just now done; and will bountifully reward thee, as I have promised thee."	1 After these things, the word of Jehovah came unto Abram in a vision, saying, Fear not, Abram; I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward.
		2. To which Abram replied, "O Jehovah	2 And Abram said, O Jehovah

[1] Ver. 1. "In a vision." All that this chapter contains to ver. 12. passed in a vision, and from ver. 12—21. in a dream; and therefore it is here said, that the word of Jehovah came to

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.	Year of Abram's age.	Place of the transaction.
God, what wilt thou give me, seeing I go childless, and the steward of my house is this Eliezer of Damascus?	Lord,[1] how can I have all the reward which thou hast promised me; since I have no child, and Eliezer of Damascus, my steward, is to be my heir? Is the meaning then of the promise thou madest me, chap. xiii. 15, 16, only this, viz.	75.	
3 And Abram said, Behold to me thou hast given no son; and one born in my house is mine heir.	3. That the seed of this my steward, whom I intend to adopt, shall be as numerous as the dust of the earth?"		
4 And behold the word of Jehovah came unto him, saying, This shall not be thine heir; but he that shall come forth out of thine own bowels, he shall be thine heir.	4. And behold the word of Jehovah came unto him, saying, "Thy steward shalt thou not adopt for thine heir; thy son, that shall come forth out of thy own loins, he shall be thine heir."		
5 And He brought him	5. And He brought Abram forth in the vi-		

Abram. Abram was a prophet, Gen. xx. 7. And that was the phrase used concerning the prophets, namely, that "the words of Jehovah came to them." And the words of Jehovah generally came to all of them except Moses, in dreams and visions. See Numb. xii. 6.

[1] Ver. 2. "Jehovah Lord." I suppose Abram calls God Adonai, or Lord, here, to acknowledge Him the proprietor and disposer of all things.

Year of Abram's age.	Place of the transaction.	PARAPHRASE.	TEXT.
75.		sion, and shewed him the stars, and told him, "That his carnal seed should be as numerous as they." [1]	forth abroad, and said, Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them: and He said, So shall thy seed be.
		6. And he believed in Jehovah, that it should be so; and his faith was counted by God to him, as if he had been completely and perfectly righteous.	6 And he believed in Jehovah, and he counted it to him for righteousness.
		7. And Jehovah said farther in the vision, "I am Jehovah that brought thee out of Ur, to give thee this land, to receive a grant, or a right of inheritance to it.	7 And He said unto him, I am Jehovah, that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give thee this land to inherit it.
		8. And Abram said, "O Jehovah Lord, what sign wilt thou give me, that I shall receive such a grant, or a right of inheritance to it?	8 And he said, O Jehovah God, whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it?
		9—18. "And Jehovah ordered him to divide an heifer, a she-goat, a ram, a turtle, and a young pigeon in the middle. And Abram having done accordingly;	9 And He said unto him, Take me an heifer of three years old, and a she-goat of three years old, and a

[1] Ver. 5. "So shall thy seed be." See Deut. i. 10. x. 22.

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.	Year of Abram's age.	Place of the transaction.
ram of three years old, and a turtledove, and a young pigeon.	and having fallen into a deep sleep, towards sunset, he found a great horror on his mind;[1]	75.	
10 And he took unto him all these, and divided them in the midst, and laid each piece one against another; but the birds divided he not.	when God came to him in his dream, and told him of the circumstances of distress that his seed should be reduced to in a strange land; but that He would avenge the cruelty of that nation towards them; and that they should at last go out of that land with great substance. That as to himself, he should die in peace,[2] and be buried in a good old age; and that in the fourth generation his carnal seed should come to that land again, and not before; for that, till that time, the iniquity of the Amorites would not be full.		
11 And when the fowls came down upon the carcases, Abram drove them away.			
12 And when the sun was going down, a deep sleep fell upon Abram; and lo, an horror of great darkness fell upon him.			
13 And He said unto Abram, Know of	And when it was dark, Jehovah caused a smoking furnace and a burning lamp to pass between the pieces, accord-		

[1] Ver. 12. "And lo an horror," &c. Such an horror was not peculiar to Abram; it fell on other prophets on similar occasions. See Dan. x. 8, 9.

[2] Ver. 15. "Thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace." God's telling Abram here, that he should die in peace, after having told him first, how his seed should be afflicted in a strange land, before they should possess the land of Canaan; and just before He tells him, that they should not be possessed of it, till the fourth generation; was telling Abram in the strongest manner that could be, without expressly saying so, that he himself should have no possession of this land under this grant.

Year of Abram's age.	Place of the transaction.	PARAPHRASE.	TEXT.
75.		ing to an ancient rite of making covenants; the meaning of which rite was, that the parties wished they might be cut asunder, like the carcases, if they did not perform their covenant.[1]	a surety, that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years. 14 And also that nation whom they shall serve will I judge: and afterwards shall they come out with great substance. 15 And thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age. 16 But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again; for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full. 17 And it came to pass when the sun went down, and it was dark, behold a smoking

[1] Ver. 17. "Passed between these pieces." See Jerem. xxxiv. 18—21.

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.	Year of Abram's age.	Place of the transaction.
furnace, and a burning lamp that passed between those pieces.		75.	
18 In that day Jehovah made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed do I give this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river Euphrates.	18—21. In that very time Jehovah made a covenant with Abram, saying, As I have told thee before, since thou hast been in this land, that I would, in some future time, grant this land to thy carnal seed, chap. xii. ver. 7, and that I would grant it to thy carnal seed, through thee, chap. xii. v. 15; so now do I make an actual grant of this land [1] unto thy carnal seed, as thy seed (or through thee), from Nile to Euphrates.		
19 The Kenites and Kenizzites, and the Kadmonites,	The Kenites, the Keniz-		
20 And the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Rephaims;			

[1] Ver. 18. "Do I give this land." So we should render it; and not, as our version does, "have I given this land." The meaning is, as I have formerly said, that I would give this land unto thy seed, Gen. xii. 7, and to thy seed through thee, Gen. xiii. 15; so unto thy seed I do now give (or grant) it: this was still in performance of the first part of the general promise made, Gen. xii., the second, and part of the third verse. And whereas God had said more particularly, Gen. xii. 7, that he would grant the land "unto his seed;" and then, chap. xiii. ver. 15, "unto him, and unto his seed" for ever: now, in pursuance of both those promises, He makes the actual grant of the land unto his seed; which grant Abram, from what God had said, chap. xiii. ver. 15, would now understand was a grant to his seed, as his seed; that is, to his seed, through him, as the original grantee. But then he would understand, that as this grant was made to his seed, as his seed, only to be possessed in the fourth generation, that the grant was a grant to him in reversion only; but still in perpetuity, or fee-simple, as the lawyers term it; being a grant in reversion to him and his heirs for ever.

Year of Abram's age.	Place of the transaction.	PARAPHRASE.	TEXT.
75.		zites,[1] &c. And all this land shall thy carnal seed have in possession in the fourth generation; though thou must die without that possession, and thy carnal seed be afflicted four hundred years before they obtain it."	21 And the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Girgashites, and the Jebusites.

SECTION IV.—Chap. xvi. 15, 16.

THE CONTENTS.

Ishmael is born to Abram by Hagar, his wife's handmaid, when he was eighty-six years old.

Year of Abram's age.	Place of the transaction.	PARAPHRASE.	TEXT.
86.		15. And Abram had a son by Hagar, his wife's handmaid (whom she gave to him for a concubine),	15 And Abram called his son's name, which Hagar bare him, Ishmael.
		16. When eighty-six	16 And A-

[1] "From Nile to Euphrates. The Kenites, Kenizzites," &c. This is a description of the country that God granted, by the boundaries of two great rivers, and by the nations that inhabited the country. Hereby the grant was reduced to the greatest certainty. See also Deut. i. 7. This was a vast tract of country. But God made His word good; for David possessed this country, 2 Sam. viii. 1. 1 Chron. xviii. 1. 14. xix. 6—19. xx. And Nehemiah observes, "that God had been faithful to (this) his covenant," Neh. ix. 8.

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.	Year of Abram's age.	Place of the transaction.
bram was fourscore and six years old when Hagar bare Ishmael to Abram.	years old, and called him Ishmael.[1]	86.	

SECTION V.—Chap. xvii. 1—21.

THE CONTENTS.

Jehovah appeared unto Abram the third time, to make His covenant with him, promising to multiply him as a spiritual father, beyond what He had promised him to multiply him as a carnal father: and likewise promising, though he was to die, without God's giving him any possession in the earthly Canaan in this life; or to any of his carnal seed after him, till the fourth generation; yet to raise him up to the everlasting possession of the paradisaical or heavenly

[1] Ver. 15. "And called his son's name Ishmael." This was the name by which the "angel of Jehovah" ordered Hagar to call him, ver. 11, when she fled from her mistress, and was in great distress; signifying, "God hath heard," namely, thy affliction. This Being is called the "angel of Jehovah;" he is not called "Jehovah" by the historian; and therefore was not the great Being that represented and personated Jehovah, but some other angel; and therefore he does not speak as Jehovah; as that great Being who represents and personates Jehovah always does; but from Jehovah. So ver. 11, he says, "And thou shalt call his name Ishmael, because Jehovah hath heard thy affliction." The like observation may be made of the "angel of Jehovah" that appeared, chap. xxii., as may appear by ver. 11. and 16.

Canaan, at the times of respiration, and of the restitution of all things, and all this his most numerous seed in all their generations. God gives him the sign and seal of circumcision; and lets him know, that this everlasting covenant (that is, the promise of it, namely, of the everlasting possession of Canaan) should belong to a son whom he should have by Sarah his wife (now no longer to be called Sarai), the name of which son should be Isaac; and not to Ishmael, whom he had had by Hagar, his wife's handmaid; and that this covenant (that is, the promise of it) should continue to the imitators and spiritual seed of Isaac, and not the imitators of Ishmael.

Year of Abram's age.	Place of the transaction.	PARAPHRASE.	TEXT.
99.		1. And when Abram was ninety-nine years old, Jehovah, whose word had come to Abram in a vision, chap. xv., to grant him an inheritance in temporal Canaan, and the possession of it to his seed in the fourth generation, now appeared to him the third time, by the great Being that personated Him, and said, "I am Alshaddai, the Almighty God; walk before me, as Adam did, before guilt made him run away from me, and hide himself; and	1 And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, Jehovah appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God, walk before me, and be thou perfect.

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.	Year of Abram's age.	Place of the transaction.
	as Enoch and Noah did afterwards, in their generations; and be thou perfect and upright, as they were;	99.	
2 And I will make my covenant between me and thee, and will multiply thee exceedingly.	2. And on that condition I, who have made a covenant with thee already, and have given a right of inheritance to the land of Canaan to thy carnal seed, through thee, and promised them the possession of it in the fourth generation, chap. xv., now am come to establish a far better covenant between me and thee: a covenant that I call, by way of excellency, *my covenant*;[1] and in general it is this; that as I have already promised that I will multiply thy carnal seed, as the dust of the earth, chap. xiii. 16, and as the stars of		

[1] Ver. 2. "My covenant." The covenant, chap. xv. ver. 18, is called "a covenant." The covenant, in this chapter, God, by way of distinction and emphasis, calls "my covenant." Abram presently understood the emphasis, and accordingly, in great devotion and thankfulness, falls prostrate on his face, which he had not done on any former appearance. The same expression, namely, "my covenant," may be seen, 1 Chron. xvi. 15, referring to the covenant in this chapter, as is plain by adding, "the word which He commanded to a thousand generations" (that is, the commandment of circumcision); and by calling it "the everlasting covenant," ver. 17, the name that is given in this chapter, ver. 19. In the New Testament it is called "the promise," Rom. iv. 13. 16. ix. 8, 9. Gal. iii. 18, 19. 29. Heb. xi. 39.

Year of Abram's age.	Place of the transaction.	PARAPHRASE.	TEXT.
99.		heaven, chap. xv. 5; so now I promise, that I will multiply thee exceedingly;[1] so that there shall be great numbers that shall imitate thee, call thee father, and be called thy children in a figurative or spiritual sense, and receive an inheritance through thee."	
		3. And Abram, in great humility and devotion, fell prostrate on his face; and then God farther said, "As for me, behold my covenant is now more immediately with thee:	3 And Abram fell on his face, and God talked with him, saying;
		4. And it is not barely that I will multiply thy imitators exceedingly among thy own descendants; but that thou shalt be a father of a multitude of other nations; even heathen and accursed nations; so as that thou shalt	4 As for me, behold, my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of a multitude of nations.

[1] "And will multiply thee exceedingly." This phrase, "I will multiply thee," in the literal signification, is no more than, I will make thee exceeding fruitful. And so it is to be understood, Gen. xvii. 20. But if it be understood so here, it does not answer the grandeur of the appearance, nor the solemnity of the preface, nor the difficulty of the condition, ver. 1, and would be only a bare repetition of what God had said before, chap. xii. 2. xiii. 16. xv. 5. I would therefore give it the figurative sense that I have expressed in the Paraphrase, which will better agree with all that goes before, and with all that follows after; particularly with ver. 5. See Note [2] on the 5th verse.

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.	Year of Abraham's age.	Place of the transaction.
	have numerous imitators among them too.		
5 Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham; for a father of a multitude of nations have I made thee.	5. And in token of this I will change thy name from Abram, signifying high father; to Abraham, signifying high father of a multitude;[1] for I have given or granted to thee, to be a father to a multitude of nations,[2] who shall imitate thee, and receive	99.	

[1] Ver. 5. "Abraham, signifying high father of a multitude." The name Abraham has this additional signification, beyond that of Abram, signifying high father, by the addition of the letter H, the initial letter of the Hebrew word Hamon, signifying a multitude.

[2] "For a father of a multitude of nations have I made thee." God had before told him, that He would make him "a great nation," Gen. xii. 2; namely, the Israelites; and that He would make him a "father of nations," namely, of Israelites, Ishmaelites, and Edomites, ver. 6. But here He says, He will make him a father of "a multitude of nations;" which three nations (of which alone Abraham, in a literal sense, may be said to be the father) cannot be. The figurative sense is that which I have given in the Paraphrase; namely, that he should be the exemplar, held forth as a pattern of faith and obedience for good men of all times, and of all nations, to copy after; and that they should receive the everlasting possession of Canaan through him. He is the father of all the faithful; and the heir of the new world, Rom. iv. 13. And they are all children of Abraham, and are to inherit through him and with him, Rom. iv. 13—25. Luke xiii. 28, 29, or as his children. This follows from the condition of the covenant, "walk before me, and be thou perfect," and the promise shall be fulfilled. And the condition being fulfilled, like a consideration paid, strengthens the claim to the promise. Abraham knew that God was no respecter of persons; and therefore knew, that if he was to obtain the promise, on that condition, and on that only, all that performed the same condition should have the same promise made good to them also. Thus this place is interpreted by St. Paul, Rom. iv. 17. And indeed, that this was not to be understood in the literal sense, might well appear to Abraham from the grandeur of the introduction, as well as from the express condition. And "Jehovah appeared unto Abram, and said, I am God Almighty." But this will still appear more fully from what follows.

Year of Abraham's age.	Place of the transaction.	PARAPHRASE.	TEXT.
99.		an inheritance through thee; as I will shew thee more fully presently.	
		6. For I will not only make thee exceeding fruitful in carnal descendants, so as that one nation shall come from thee, as I promised thee, Gen. xiii. 2. And as I now also farther promise thee, that several nations (namely, Israelites, Ishmaelites, and Edomites,) shall come out of thee; and so as that the kings of those nations shall come from thy loins:	6 And I will make thee exceeding fruitful, and I will make nations of thee, and kings come out of thee.
		7. But moreover, and what I now chiefly intend, is to establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy spiritual seed after thee, in all their generations,[1] in the strongest manner, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God, or a Father, or a Giver of an everlasting possession unto thee,[2] and unto thy spiritual seed, after or through thee, in all their generations; which is the first time I have ever promised to be a God	7 And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee.

[1] Ver. 7. "Their generations:" that is, all their generations. See chap. xvii. ver. 12.

[2] "And I will be a God:" that is, "a father, or the giver of an everlasting possession."

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

Year of Abraham's age. Place of the transaction. 99.

to any; while I promised the possession of what I granted to thy seed, chap. xv. (and which is but a temporary possession) only in the fourth generation.

8 And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting

8. And the everlasting possession, that I, as a God or a Father, will give unto thee,[1] and unto thy spiritual seed, after or through thee,[2] in all their generations, is this, the land wherein thou now sojournest; namely,

[1] Ver. 8. "And I will give unto thee." In the xvth chapter, ver. 18, God said, "unto thy seed do I (now) give this land." Here it is, "I will give." The tense is altered: and this, among other things, shews, that the covenant there is different from that in the xvth chapter—"I will give it to thee." What? "The land of thy sojourning; or where thou art a stranger; and hast no inheritance in possession, no, not so much as thy foot can cover, Acts vii. 5; yet all this land of thy pilgrimage, all the land of Canaan, as I have bounded it, chap. xv. ver. 18—21, will I give unto thee. Indeed I have told thee, that thou shalt have no possession in its present state, or in this life, chap. xv. ver. 15. Nay, I have told thee so in this very verse; having called it the land wherein thou art (and shalt be) a stranger, even to thy death. But I will raise thee up to it, when it shall be a paradisaical or an heavenly country, Heb. xi. 16; and then I will give it all unto thee, and thou shalt be the heir of the world," Rom. iv. 13. Thus Abraham, after he had patiently endured (all the fatigues of his travels, &c.) obtained the promise, Heb. vi. 15. See the like promise made to Isaac, Gen. xxvi. 3; to Jacob, chap. xxviii. 13, xxxv. 12; and to all three, Exod. vi. 4. 8, Deut. i. 8, xi. 21, xxx. 20.

[2] "And to thy seed after (or through) thee." Abraham, knowing that the promise was conditional to him, would know, that it was conditional also to his seed; and therefore would know that seed here, and what was promised to them here, was not what seed meant, or what had been promised to them, chap. xv. 11; for that promise was absolute. And as the condition here was piety and uprightness, he must know, that seed here must stand for those who would imitate him; and not for those that should barely descend from him.

Year of Abraham's age.	Place of the transaction.	PARAPHRASE.	TEXT.
99.		all the land of Canaan, bounded as chap. xv. 18—21, the very same tract of country that I have granted unto thy carnal seed, in the fourth generation, for a temporal possession before; and I will give it unto thee and them for an everlasting possession,[1] when thou and they, at the times of respiration, shall be capable of enjoying this land; and when this land, at the times of the restitution of all things, shall be capable of being enjoyed by thee, and them, as	possession; and I will be their God.

[1] "For an everlasting possession." God had granted the land of Canaan as an inheritance in reversion to Abraham, and as an inheritance in possession to his seed in the fourth generation, chap. xv. ver. 18, compared with ver. 7, 8. But here He promises the land of Canaan to Abraham himself, and also to his seed, in all their generations, for "an everlasting possession." A man may have an inheritance in him, when not he, but his seed only, will have the possession. But possession is a personal thing; and the possession of Abraham's seed cannot be the possession of Abraham; though Abraham's inheritance would be the inheritance of his carnal seed; inasmuch as they would derive their title to that inheritance through him, or from the original grant made to him. Besides, it is an "everlasting possession" that is here promised unto Abraham, and unto his seed, which is a quite different thing from an inheritance to Abraham, and to his seed for ever. That is but a grant in fee-simple, as the lawyers call it; like a common inheritance to a man and his heirs for ever; that is, such an estate as will go to his heirs for ever, if there be nothing to interrupt it. But an everlasting possession being personal to Abraham, he knew that he must be raised up to it, and so enjoy it as an everlasting possession. He would also know this from the everlasting possession's being promised to his seed in all their generations; whereas the temporary possession of the inheritance of the earthly Canaan was not promised till the fourth generation, chap. xv. 16.

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.	Year of Abraham's age.	Place of the transaction.
	an everlasting possession. And this is what I mean, by saying, that I will be the God of thee, and of thy seed.[1] And now thou knowest the full import of what I intended, when I spake to thee in Ur, as it is recorded, chap. xii. ver. 1—4; and told thee, that I would bless all families of the earth in and through thee.	99.	
9 And God said unto Abraham, Thou shalt keep my covenant, therefore, thou, and thy seed after thee, in their generations.	9. And God said unto Abraham, "Thou shalt observe that which is the sign of this my covenant, thou, and thy seed after thee, in all their generations:		

[1] "And I will be their God." This is what I would have you understand by my saying, "I will be a God to thee, and to thy seed after thee;" that is, I will raise thee and thy spiritual seed to the everlasting possession of paradisaical Canaan. Abraham's being raised up to life was included in God's promise to "bless him," Gen. xii. 3, in "counting his faith for righteousness," Gen. xv. 6; but more clearly still in the promise of the everlasting possession of Canaan. So our Saviour understands these words, "the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob," Luke xx. 36, 37; for it is from these words that he forms his argument for the resurrection. And this is the mercy which Zecharias says, Christ was to "shew the fathers, Abraham, &c. the covenant which He made, and the oath which He sware to Abraham," Luke i, 72, 73. Hence it is, that everlasting life is said to be the "blessing of Abraham that came on the Gentiles;" and that the "promise of the Spirit" is also said to be the promise to Abraham; namely, by a metonymy of the cause for the effect; the Spirit being to be the efficient of our resurrection, as he is the pledge of it in the mean time, Gal. iii. 14.

Year of Abraham's age.	Place of the transaction.	PARAPHRASE.	TEXT.
99.		10—14. "And it is this; every man-child among you shall be circumcised,[1] when he is eight days old, in all your generations, whether he is of thy seed, or	10 This is my covenant which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee; every man-

[1] Ver. 10. "Every man-child among you shall be circumcised." If circumcision had been only a sign and a seal of the covenant (or promise) of the temporary possession of the earthly Canaan in the fourth generation, made chap. xv., why was not circumcision enjoined at the time of making that covenant? This shews, that circumcision was not a sign and a seal of that covenant only. Nor is it enjoined till after the promise of the everlasting possession of paradisaical or heavenly Canaan was made to Abraham and to his seed, that so the promise of that everlasting possession might be sure to the faithful seed that is uncircumcised, as well as to that which is circumcised; so St. Paul informs us, Rom. iv. 11—18. But as the covenant or promise was twofold, and the seed twofold (the one the promise of the temporary possession of the earthly Canaan to the carnal seed in the fourth generation; the other the promise of the everlasting possession of the paradisaical or heavenly Canaan, to the spiritual seed, in all their generations): so the circumcision was twofold also; that in the flesh (which assured Abraham's seed of the temporary possession of the earthly Canaan in the fourth generation); an institution, which in those hot countries might make them multiply the faster; for which Philo, l. ii. § 37, assigns a reason; which was the most proper sign to assure them of that covenant, "or promise to their seed," and to make them remember it; "and the circumcision, which is in the heart, in the spirit" (or in the spiritual or figurative sense), which assured them of the everlasting possession of the paradisaical or heavenly Canaan in all their generations. This spiritual or figurative circumcision was understood to be the meaning and signification of circumcision in the flesh, by the author of this history, and by other writers of the Old Testament, as well as of the New. See Deut. x. 16. xxx. 6. Lev. xxvi. 41. Jer. iv. 4. ix. 26. Ezek. xliv. 7. See also Acts vii. 51. Rom. ii. 25. 28, 29. Phil. iii. 2, 3. And it was understood so from hence, that as the circumcision in the flesh was the cutting off of something superfluous, or that might be spared; and might tempt the seed of Abraham to excess in venereal matters; so it signified the circumcision in the heart, or the excision of all appetites and passions that fascinate and bewitch the mind. See to this purpose the texts last quoted, and James i. 21: "Laying aside all filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness." See also, Philo, ib. de Circumc. p. 811, and lib. de Migrat. Abr. p. 402.

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.	Year of Abraham's age.	Place of the transaction.
child among you shall be circumcised.	is born under thy roof, or becomes thy property, as a slave; all these being a fixed part of thy family: though an hired servant, who is but an unsettled part of thy family, shall not.	99.	
11 And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant between me and you.	And he that is a settled part of thy family, that does not bear this badge and mark in his flesh, of his being one of my family, shall be cut off from his people; as one that will not observe my covenant, since he neglects the sign and seal of it.		
12 And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man-child in their generations, he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed.	For I intend it, not only as a seal to confirm your faith of my promise, but as a mark to distinguish thy family by, in all future times, for wise reasons (though some of them are at this time hidden from mankind); and for the present, to separate thy family, in which virtue and religion shall be preserved, from all the other idolatrous families of the world; from any imitation of their manners, any intimate conversation, or intermarriages with them, or with any of their descendants."		
13 He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised, and my covenant shall be in thy flesh for an everlasting covenant.			
14 And the uncircumcised man-child, whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall			

Year of Abraham's age.	Place of the transaction.	PARAPHRASE.	TEXT.
99.			be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant.
		15. And as God had changed the name of Abram into Abraham, so he changed Sarai's name into Sarah;	15 And God said unto Abraham, As for Sarai thy wife, thou shalt not call her name Sarai, but Sarah shall her name be.
		16. Signifying, that she should be a mother of nations; namely, Israelites and Edomites;[1] and that kings of those countries should descend from her.	16 And I will bless her, and give thee a son also of her: yea, I will bless her; she shall be a mother of nations; kings of people shall be of her.
		17—22. Upon Abraham's first considering the little likelihood there was of his having a child by Sarah, he prayed, that Ishmael might be the person, to whom this promise or covenant should belong. But God tells him, No; "That it should belong to his son Isaac, by Sarah, who, as an imitator of him, would answer his name, and give him true joy and satisfaction; and to such	17 Then Abraham fell upon his face, and laughed, and said in his heart, Shall a child be born unto him that is an hundred years old? And shall Sarah, that is ninety years old, bear? 18 And Abraham said unto God, O that Ishmael might live before thee!

[1] Ver. 13. "Sarah, signifying the mother of a multitude;" namely, by the addition of H. See note [1] ver. 5.

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.	Year of Abraham's age.	Place of the transaction.
19 And God said, Sarah thy wife shall surely bear thee a son indeed, and thou shalt call his name Isaac: and I will establish my covenant with him for an everlasting covenant, and with	also as should be the seed or imitators of Isaac, and not the seed or imitators of Ishmael. And as to Ishmael, God adds, I will hear thy prayer, so as to make him fruitful and great;[1] but for my covenant about the everlasting possession of Canaan, it shall be with Isaac[2]	99.	

[1] Ver. 20. "And as to Ishmael, I will bless him, and make him fruitful." God here promises Ishmael temporal prosperity in the same terms that He promised it to Abraham and Sarah, or to Isaac. Compare this verse with Gen. xii. 2, and part of the 3d verse; and with the 6th, 15th, and 16th verses of this chapter; and with chap. xxi. ver. 13.

[2] "But my covenant will I establish with Isaac." This shews, that by these terms, "my covenant," God does not mean temporal blessings, great fruitfulness and grandeur; those that God had promised to Ishmael, and to his descendants, ver. 20; and yet he says, ver. 21, "my covenant will I establish with Isaac." This God also calls "His everlasting covenant," ver. 19; that is, the covenant of "the everlasting possession of Canaan." It is called the "everlasting covenant," 1 Chron. xvi. 17. Psalm cv. 10. Isa. xxiv. 5. This covenant is always included, when the covenant of Abrahamic circumcision is mentioned; and is sometimes the whole of what is meant by it, Acts vii. 8. And this everlasting covenant, God says, He will establish with Abraham and his seed, by Isaac, and not by Ishmael; that is, with the imitators of Isaac, and not with the imitators of Ishmael. For not only a child or descendant of Ishmael, but of Canaan, an Amorite, or an Hittite, being an imitator of Abraham by Isaac, would be blessed in them. To this purpose it is, that God, afterwards speaking of Ishmael, says, "Let it not be grievous in thy sight, because of the lad; for in Isaac shall thy seed be called, chap. xxi. ver. 12. For it is not the children of the flesh (of Abraham) that are the children of God, but the children of the promise," that are counted for the seed; that is, the children to whom the promise of the everlasting covenant is made (as it was with Isaac, when God said, "At this time will I come, and Sarah shall have a son, and I will establish my covenant with him for an everlasting covenant); it is, I say, those children of the promise that are counted for the seed, Rom. ix. 1. See Rom. iv. 13—18. Gal. iii. 28, 29.

Year of Abraham's age.	Place of the transaction.	PARAPHRASE.	TEXT.
99.		(whom Sarah shall bear to thee this time twelve months), and with his seed; as I have just now said to thee."	his seed after him. 20 And as for Ishmael, I have heard thee: behold, I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful, and will multiply him exceedingly: twelve princes shall he beget, and I will make him a great nation. 21 But my covenant will I establish with Isaac, whom Sarah shall bear unto thee in this set time in the next year.

SECTION VI.—Chap. xviii. 1, 2; 9, 10; 17, 18.

THE CONTENTS.

God appears the fourth time to Abraham, to assure him, that Isaac should be born of Sarah in nine months time. And God is recorded to have repeated both the covenants with Abraham, namely, that of the xvth of Genesis, about the temporal possession of Canaan; and that of the xviiith, about the everlasting possession of

Canaan; as the reason for his revealing to him the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah.

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.	Year of Abraham's age.	Place of the transaction.
1 And Jehovah appeared unto him in the oaks of Mamre; and he sat in the tent-door in the heat of the day.	1. And Jehovah appeared to him (Abraham) in the oaks of Mamre,	99 and 3 months.	Grove of Oaks in Mamre, in Hebron, in Canaan.
2 And he lift up his eyes, and looked, and lo, three men stood by him: and when he saw them, he ran to meet them, from the tent-door, and bowed Himself toward the ground.	2. With two other angels, in the shape of men.		
9 And they said unto him, Where is Sarah thy wife? And he said, Behold, in the tent.	9. And they said unto him, Where is Sarah thy wife? And Abraham said, Behold, in the tent.		
10 And He said, I will certainly return unto thee according to the time of life; and lo, Sarah thy wife shall have a son.	10. And Jehovah said, "I will certainly make good my promise to thee, and in nine months time, the usual time of life of a child in the womb, Sarah thy wife shall have a son."		
17 And Jehovah said, Shall I hide from Abraham the thing which I do?	17. And Jehovah said, Shall I hide from Abraham the thing which I am just going to do;		

Year of Abraham's age.	Place of the transaction.	PARAPHRASE.	TEXT.
99 and 3 months.		18. Seeing that Abraham's carnal seed shall become a great and mighty nation, blessed by me with all temporal prosperity; and that all the nations of the earth shall be blessed[1] with the removal of the curse, and the restoring the original blessing in or through him; that is, on their imitating him, or on their walking before me and being perfect, as he is, and so becoming his spiritual seed?	18 Seeing that Abraham shall surely become a great and mighty nation, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him.

[1] Ver. 18. "Shall be blessed." God having, in explication of what He had said more generally (Gen. xii. 2, and the former part of the 3d verse), and of what He had said more particularly (ver. 7, and chap. xiii. ver. 15.), at last made two covenants with Abraham, a covenant to give him the temporary possession of Canaan, to his carnal seed in the fourth generation, chap. xv. ver. 18, and a covenant to give the everlasting possession of the heavenly or paradisaical Canaan, to him, and to his spiritual seed in all their generations, chap. xvii. ver. 7, 8, now appears to Abraham the fourth time, to tell him, that he shall have Isaac by Sarah in nine months, see Gen. xxi. 5. 7, 8, and (after saying, "shall I hide from Abraham the thing that I do?") speaks of both these covenants in these terms; seeing "that Abraham shall become a great nation;" there is the temporal covenant of Gen. xvth: "And all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him;" there is the everlasting covenant of Gen. xvii. 7, 8.

SECTION VII.—Chap. xxi. 33.

THE CONTENTS.

On the birth of Isaac, to whose spiritual seed the promise or everlasting covenant was to con-

tinue, Abraham plants a grove, and calls on Jehovah, as the everlasting God.

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.	Year of Abraham's age.	Place of the transaction.
Upon Isaac's birth, on which the alliance between Abraham and Abimelech ensued;		100.	
33 Abraham planted a grove in Beersheba, and called there on the name of Jehovah the everlasting God.	33. As Abraham had built an altar or pillar on God's first appearing to him in Canaan, to promise him, that He would grant that land to his seed, chap. xii. 7, and as he had built another on God's promising that He would grant that land to him, and to his seed through him; so now, on God's having promised the everlasting possession of Canaan, to him and his imitators by Isaac, and on his having given him Isaac, Abraham plants a grove, and with his family called on the name of Jehovah, in their public devotions, as "the everlasting God;" that is, as the Giver of Canaan for an everlasting possession unto Abraham, and unto his imitators, in all their generations.		Beersheba in Canaan.

SECTION VIII.—Chap. xxii. 15—19.

THE CONTENTS.

On Abraham's being found faithful, when God tried him, by ordering him to offer up his son Isaac, God, by an angel out of heaven, again repeats the two covenants with Abraham, namely, that of the xvth, and that of the xviith of Genesis; and confirms them both to him by an oath.

Year of Abraham's age.	Place of the transaction.	PARAPHRASE.	TEXT.
125.	Mount Moriah in Canaan. ver. 2.	15. After the Angel of Jehovah had prevented Abraham from slaying his son Isaac, he (the Angel) called again to him out of heaven, and said;	15 And the Angel called unto Abraham out of heaven the second time;
		16. "By myself have I sworn, saith Jehovah, that since thou hast not withheld thy son, thy only son,	16 And said, By myself have I sworn, saith Jehovah, for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son;
		17. "That surely I will bless thee, by giving thee all temporal felicity; namely, by multiplying thy carnal seed exceedingly, as the stars of heaven, and the sand	17 That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed, as the stars of heaven,

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.	Year of Abraham's age.	Place of the transaction.
and as the sand which is upon the sea-shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies:	on the sea-shore; and by making thy natural seed successful and victorious over their enemies the Canaanites, whose land and whose cities, the strongest holds of it, they shall possess:	125.	
18 And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice.	18. But above all, I swear, that I will bless thee with still better blessings than those temporal ones that I have mentioned; for in becoming thy spiritual seed, or thy imitators, shall all the nations of the earth be blessed,[1]		

[1] Ver. 18. "Shall be blessed." The last thing we meet with concerning these two covenants in Abraham's history, is that (chap. xxii. ver. 16, 17, 18.) on the extraordinary occasion of Abraham's fidelity, when he was tried about offering his son Isaac, God repeats both these covenants, and confirms them with an oath; "that by two immutable things, by which it was impossible that God should lie, we might have strong consolation," Heb. vi. 18. The temporal covenant of the xvth chapter God repeats in these words, in this xxiid chapter, ver 17: "That in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars in heaven, and as the sand on the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies," namely, the Canaanites. And the everlasting covenant of chap. xvii. ver. 7, 8, He repeats in these words, ver. 18: "And in thy seed shall all the nations of the world be blessed." These two covenants are repeated in much the same manner to Isaac, Gen. xxvi.; the first in the 3d, and the greatest part of the 4th verse; the second in the last clause of that verse. They are likewise repeated in much the same manner to Jacob, Gen. xxviii.; the first in the 13th, and the greater part of the 14th verse; the second in the last clause of that verse. And so also are they repeated by the son of Sirach, Ecclesiasticus xliv. the first, ver. 21, except the first clause; and the second, ver. 20, and the first clause of the 21st verse and the 22d verse: in that verse He calls the second covenant with Isaac, "the blessing of all men, and the covenant."

The author of the epistle to the Hebrews quotes these words, Gen. xxii. 17, 18, only by quoting the words of the 17th verse; saying, "surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will

		PARAPHRASE.	TEXT.
Year of Abraham's age. 125.	Place of the transaction.	" with the same blessing that thou art; namely, the everlasting posses-	

multiply thee;" without quoting the rest of the 17th and 18th verse. It is as if he had quoted it thus: "surely blessing I will bless thee," &c. I think there is another instance of such an *et cætera* quotation by St. Paul, Acts xiii. 25, from Luke iii. 16: "And as John fulfilled his course, he said, Whom think ye that I am? I am not He; but behold there cometh One after me, whose shoes of His feet I am not worthy to loose:" he stops there, without quoting the rest of the verse, namely, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire;" though these last words seem to have been chiefly intended by St. Paul in that quotation.

And that seed in the promise made to Abraham, Gen. xii. 18, to Isaac, Gen. xxvi. 4, and to Jacob, Gen. xxviii. 14, signifies imitators, and not descendants; or even Jesus Christ, one of them, may be seen, Dissertation No. IV.

These two covenants are often referred to separately and jointly. The temporal covenant is referred to separately, 1 Chron. xvi. 19—23. Nehem. ix. 8. Acts vii. 5—8. The everlasting covenant is referred to separately, 1 Chron. xvi. 15—19. Acts vii. first part of the 8th verse, Rom. iv. 13, 14. Gal. iii. 14. 18, 19. 22. 29. iv. 28. Heb. vi. 17. xi. 39; and both together come under the name of the promises, Heb. xi. 13, compared with verse 39, or of the "covenants of promise," Eph. ii. 12, or of the "covenants," Rom. ix. 4. In this place St. Paul says, "who are Israelites," not Abramites, because Abram had Ishmael, as well as Isaac; not Isaacites, because Isaac had Esau as well as Israel; but Israelites, because Israel had no sons, that were not reckoned for the seed. St. Paul goes on, "to whom pertaineth the adoption;" for the Israelites, as descended from Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, are sons of God, Exod. iv. 22, "and the glory;" for when God had long retired from the world soon after the flood, for its wickedness, He (the God of glory) "appeared unto Abraham," Acts vii. 2, as also to Isaac and to Jacob; and at last dwelt among the Israelites in the tabernacle and temple; "and the covenants;" that is, the covenant of the temporary possession of "earthly Canaan" to the carnal seed of Abraham in the fourth generation, in the xvth of Genesis; "and the giving the law," namely, at Sinai, about four hundred and thirty years after the covenants; "and the service" (λατρεία,) namely, all the ritual service that was enjoined after the idolatry of the golden calf, though, as it should seem, not intended before; "and the promises;" that is, all the promises made in confirmation of either of these covenants, from the time of Moses to the days of Malachi; particularly the promises made to David and his royal race. By the place that St. Paul gives the cove-

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.	Year of Abraham's age.	Place of the transaction.
	sion of Canaan, at the times of the restitution of all things to their original blessed state; and at the times of respiration, when thou and they shall be capable of enjoying it.	125.	
19 So Abraham returned to his young men, and they rose up and went to Beersheba; and Abraham dwelt in Beersheba.	19. After the Angel had said this, Abraham returned to his young men, whom he had bid to wait at a distance till he and Isaac went farther and worshipped, ver. 5, and they all returned to Beersheba, from whence they had set out towards Mount Moriah, and where Abraham still continued to dwell.		

nants here, namely, after the adoption, and the glory; and before "the giving of the law, the service, and the promises;" it is plain, that "the covenants" here must signify the covenant of the xvth of Genesis, and the covenant of the xviiith; and no other covenants whatsoever: for these are the only covenants that God made with Abraham or his seed, after the appearing of the glory, since its recess; and before the giving of the law at Mount Sinai.

No. VI.

A DISSERTATION

TO SHEW

THAT THE EXPRESSION, GAL. III. 16, "BUT TO SEED, AS OF ONE, WHICH IS CHRIST," DOES NOT SIGNIFY JESUS CHRIST; BUT THE "ONE SEED," BOTH OF THE LAW AND OF FAITH, "ANOINTED BY THAT SPIRIT," WHICH WAS PROMISED TO ABRAHAM, AND IMPARTED TO JEWISH AND GENTILE BELIEVERS UNDER THE GOSPEL.

I WILL now endeavour to shew, (as I undertook vol. ii. p. 516.) that the promise which God made to Abraham, Gen. xiii. 3. xxii. 18, "in thee, or in thy seed, shall all the nations of the earth be blessed," (as it is quoted and argued by St. Paul, Gal. iii. 8,) does not mean, that in or by one of thy descendants, namely, Jesus Christ, I will bless all the nations of the earth; but that it means, that I will bless all that shall become thy spiritual seed, or that shall imitate thee. In order to it, you must give me leave to premise,

1. That, in my way of understanding the iid and iiid of the Galatians, these several expressions, "justification," (chap. ii. ver. 16. chap. iii. 18.) or "accounting for righteousness," (ver. 6.) "the Spirit," (ver. 2. 5. 14.) or "the blessing of Abraham," (ver. 8, 9. 14.) "gospel," (ver. 8.) "life," (ver. 21.) and "inheritance," (ver. 18.) are with St. Paul in effect the same thing, and are promiscuously used by him in this chapter, as any one of these terms will best suit the other expressions he has occasion to use in the several parts of it. I cannot but think, that the promiscuous use of these terms may be very well accounted for in this manner: justification is God's final acquittal of a man from a charge; which, if it had been adjudged to be true, must have ended in death; but which being adjudged to be false, brings on the sentence of everlasting life. This acquittal, or justification, is, in other words, being "accounted righteous;" or "having faith (that is, "fidelity," or "sincere obedience") accounted for righteousness." The Spirit is to raise us up to eternal life, and was, in the mean time, the earnest of that resurrection to the Galatians. Blessing signifies the removal of the curse, and the restoring the original blessing; namely, bliss and immortality. "The blessing of Abraham" is the blessing promised to Abraham; namely, that which was promised in general

terms to him, Gen. xiii. 3. "In thee (that is, in blessing thee) shall all the families (or nations who imitate thee) be blessed;" and which came to be more particularly explained, Gen. xvii. 7, 8, that God would bless Abraham and all his seed (or his pious imitators), with that everlasting "possession of Canaan," called, therefore, an "inheritance," Gal. iii. 18, and which God afterwards confirms by an oath; "that in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed," Gen. xxii. 18. So that St. Paul makes no difference between any of these three promises, the second being but an explication of the first; and the third but a confirmation of the first and second, by the oath of God. Yet the first promise is more generally referred to by St. Paul in this chapter; particularly ver. 17, as plainly appears by the note of time that he adds; for it is four hundred and thirty years before the giving of the law, that God said to Abraham, (Gen. xiii. 3,) "In thee shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." Life is everlasting life; inheritance is the right we have to it; and the gospel is the good news, either of the title, or of the actual inheritance of it.

I must premise, 2. That St. Paul uses promise and covenant promiscuously; both of them signifying the promise or covenant, that God would give "justification, righteousness, the

Spirit, blessing," or "the blessing of Abraham, inheritance," or "life," or glad tidings, to Abraham, and to his seed.

I must premise, 3. That seed, or one seed, in this chapter, signifies Abraham's one believing seed of all nations; particularly of Jews and Gentiles, now made one, by being baptized into Jesus Christ, and putting on Christ, ver. 27, (as Christians used to do new clothes after baptism,) whereby, without any manner of distinction "of Jew or Gentile, bond or free, male or female," we all become one seed; whereas, he that was not of Abraham's family, or that was an hired servant in it, or a female, could not be circumcised. And as the apostle adds, "if we be one seed in Christ Jesus (as the Clermont copy reads it, and as the true reading certainly is), then are we Abraham's seed (or one seed), and heirs according to the promise;" that is to say more generally, heirs of the blessing of Abraham, that was promised, Gen. xiii. 3, or, more particularly, heirs of the everlasting possession of Canaan, promised, Gen. xvii. 7, 8, and confirmed by an oath to his seed, or to those that should be his imitators, Gen. xxii. 18. This seed, or one seed, stands with St. Paul in opposition to seeds, or two sorts of seed, namely, "those that are of faith" (ἐκ πίστεως), ver. 7, and those that are "of the works of the law" (ἐξ ἔργων νόμου), ver.

10. St. Paul speaks of these two sorts of seeds, Rom. iv. 13—18, and ix. 6—9, only he varies the expression in the last place, calling the two seeds, "the seed of (or according to) the flesh;" and "the seed of (or according to) the promise." St. Peter, in a similar manner, Acts iii. 25, 26, "ye are the children of the covenant, which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed:" and therefore adds, "unto you Jews," as part of that seed, "first (God having raised up His Son Jesus) sent Him to bless you, in turning every one of you from his iniquities:" in consequence of which they would certainly become righteous in the sight of God, and of course obtain justification to everlasting life, which is expressed by St. Peter, ver. 19. 21, by "their sins being blotted out, when the times of refreshing (or respiration, ἀναψύξεως) should come from the presence of the Lord (who will be revealed against the wicked in flaming fire)," and by "the restitution of all things," namely, to their paradisaical state. By all this (I think) it appears, that the blessing promised to Abraham, in these words, "in thee, or in thy seed, shall all the nations of the earth be blessed" (as the words stand in Genesis, and according to the interpretation of all the New Testament writers that quote them), signifies the good news

of everlasting life, or of the Spirit (who is to raise us up to everlasting life), and not Jesus Christ; notwithstanding that He was of the seed of Abraham according to the flesh. But this will appear more fully by what follows.

I must premise, 4. That St. Paul gives this one seed a name in the singular number, to suit it the better, namely, Christ, ver. 16, 17; that is, "the anointed" (namely, seed); this one seed which had received the promise of the Spirit, or the Spirit that had been promised (which is our unction, 2 Cor. i. 21, 22. 1 John ii. 20. 27), ver. 14. The believing Jews received it first after Christ's ascension; and the Gentiles afterwards, both the idolatrous and the devout. Christ has this signification, Psal. cv. 15, ("Touch not mine anointed," Χριστοὺς, according to the LXX,) and Heb. xi. 26.

Now having premised these things, that I may make it appear the more plainly, that the seed (or the one seed), ver. 16, signifies all those of the works of the law, and of faith, who are made one, by being anointed with one Spirit, or by being baptized into one Spirit, as the one Spirit of the one Lord (Mediator) and of one God, even the Father, and not Jesus Christ; I will consider the thread of St. Paul's argument in part of the second and third chapters of the Galatians. His argument is to prove that the Galatians, as well as all other believing Gentiles,

and even the Jews, were justified by faith, and not by the works of the law, chap. ii. ver. 16. And the sum of his argument to support this assertion is, that " they received the Spirit (the earnest of their resurrection, and by which they should at last be raised from the dead) by believing the word, which they had heard from Paul; and not by the works of the law, ver. 2, just as he (Paul) that ministered the Spirit to them, and wrought miracles among them (the special miracles of an apostle), did it by the faith of that word of the gospel, which he had heard from Christ, and which he preached to them, and not by the works of the law, ver. 5, and just as Abraham was justified by believing, ver. 6. He therefore adds, that men only became the children (or seed) of Abraham, by believing God, as Abraham did, or by imitating his faith, ver. 7. And God foreseeing that He would (in His due time) justify the heathen (or all nations) to everlasting life, through faith, preached the good news beforehand to Abraham, in the promise He made to him, Gen. xii. 3, " In thee shall all nations be blessed," ver. 8. So that it follows, that " all they which be of faith" (or of the seed of faith, ἐκ πίστεως) are (now, and were then) blessed (along) with faithful Abraham," ver. 9, whereas, on the contrary, that seed of Abraham, who were ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, must be under the curse of the

law, instead of the blessing (or justification to everlasting life), according to the doctrine of the Old Testament itself; Habakkuk having asserted, "that the just (or righteous) shall live by faith" (that is, everlastingly); whereas in truth Christ has died to redeem us Jews from the curse, that we were under by the law, being made a curse for us; and to impart the blessing of Abraham to the Gentiles, through their faith in the word, which they had heard from St. Paul, ver. 10—15. Now St. Paul adds, a covenant among men is a thing that cannot be altered by any, but the parties themselves; it is unalterable by every one else, ver. 15. But (the covenants, or) the promises that God made to Abraham, He made to Abraham, and to his seed, ver. 16; so they run, Gen. xii. 3. xvii. 7, 8. xxii. 18; then it cannot be to *seeds;* for seed is but one sort of seed, and not two or more sorts of seed. Now, says he, that one seed is Christ, or the two different sorts of people considered as one, or being anointed with the one Spirit; and therefore the promises of blessing belong to you, who are of the one seed of faith, and have by it received the Spirit, as well as the Jews. And, as he adds, if any should suggest to you, that the law has disannulled the promise, that "in thy seed shall all nations be blessed," which God had confirmed (by an oath, Gen. xxii. 18) to Christ (εἰς Χριστὸν, that

is, to the anointed people); I answer, that it is impossible; because the first promise of that kind, made Gen. xii. 3, explained and confirmed by the promise, Gen. xvii. 7, 8, and xxii. 18, was four hundred and thirty years before the law, ver. 17; whereas, on the contrary, if the inheritance of blessing to Abraham had been given him by the law, it could not have been given by promise, as it most certainly was; as may be plainly seen, Gen. xii. 3. xvii. 7, 8. xxii. 28. And if it should still be said, why then was the law added? St. Paul answers, it was added, to shew the Israelites the punishment due to every transgression of the law of nature, by giving them such a number of more precepts than there were in the law of nature, and by making death the penalty of the breach of a great many of them; that so the Jews, seeing themselves so manifestly "concluded under sin," both by frequent breaches of the numerous laws they were under, and by death, that often followed, might be led by the law to the gospel; where they would see, that they might obtain righteousness and life. But this law was only added, till that "one seed" should come, to whom the promise of life and blessedness is made; which one seed is made up of a body of Jews and Gentiles, by one faith in one God, through one Lord, and by one Spirit. This law was ordained by angels in the hands of a me-

diator; namely, Moses, ver. 19. But still, says he, this very thought suggests another, that may farther serve to shew, that the law could not vacate the promise made to Abraham and his seed; because Moses (as the incomparable Mr. Locke first observed), who was the mediator at the giving of the law at Sinai, was only a mediator of a covenant, where but one of the parties concurred, that concurred to Abraham's covenant; for Abraham's covenant was a covenant between God and Abraham, and his one seed of faith: now Moses was only a mediator between God (one of the parties indeed), but was not a mediator between God and Abraham, and the one seed of faith, the other party to Abraham's covenant; for Abraham and the Gentiles of all nations, who were part of that one seed of faith, were not there; whereas, if Moses had been a mediator of such a covenant at Sinai, as could have vacated the covenant with Abraham and his seed; he should have been a mediator of a covenant between both those parties (namely, God, Abraham, and his spiritual seed of all nations), and not of a covenant between one of those parties only; namely, God, and quite another party (the carnal seed of Abraham, by Isaac, and Jacob), which was the case at Mount Sinai, ver. 20. St. Paul then intersperses some thoughts to prove, that the law, instead of being intended to be against

the promises, which God made to Abraham, or to vacate them, by giving righteousness and life (which was alone to be had by faith in the promise), was only intended to bring us to the faith of Christ; by which alone the body of the Gentiles come to be children of God, and one with the believing Jews, ver. 25. He then brings his last argument to shew, that we become one seed by faith in God (through the word of God preached by Christ and His apostles), from the significant rite of initiation; by which we are baptized into one body and one Spirit; and then concludes, ver. ult., that if "we are one (seed) in" (by faith in God) through "Christ Jesus, then are we Abraham's (one) seed" to whom the promise was made, Gen. xii. 3, as explained xvii. 7, 8, and confirmed, xxii. 18, "and (consequently) heirs according to that promise."

If it should be objected against the sense I have given to the word Christ, ver. 16, and 17, (namely, *anointed*, meaning the seed anointed by the Spirit,) that it cannot be thought to be the true sense of it, but that Jesus Christ must be denoted by it, whom St. Paul denotes by the name Christ, ver. 13th, 24th, 27th, and 29th; I answer, that it is not an uncommon thing to find St. Paul keep his term, and vary his sense. But I must observe, that it is not likely that he has done so in this chapter. He

here varies his term and his sense together; for there are very good copies that give us other readings in those verses: ver. 13th, some copies read *Κύριος*; ver. 24th, some copies read *Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν*; ver. 27th, some copies read as ver. 24th; and ver. 29th is read with the same addition. I prefer these readings to Stephens', which our translators followed; because I find, that whenever St. Paul designed to denote Christ's person by the name Christ in every other verse of this chapter, he adds Jesus to it; an addition that he does not always make elsewhere; as if he designed to reserve the word *Χριστὸς*, to denote this one seed anointed by the Spirit, whether Jews or Gentiles; and so added Jesus to Christ every where else in the chapter, to prevent mistakes.

No. VII.

A DISSERTATION

ON

HEBREWS xii. 22——25.

This place of Scripture being one of the most difficult in the New Testament, it will be necessary to take in all the aids towards clearing the sense of it, that we can possibly get. We must therefore, in the first place, carefully endeavour to trace the connexion it has with the foregoing part of the epistle. The immediate connexion of these four verses is evidently with the four verses that immediately precede them; namely, the 18—22: but to see how all the eight verses, from the 18th to the 25th, stand immediately connected with what goes before, we must look as far back as the xth chapter; otherwise we shall be apt to think, that this portion of Scripture comes in altogether abruptly, and that it is a part of the epistle detached from the rest. It may at the same time be of

use to shew, how all these verses, together with that part of the epistle with which they are immediately connected, stand related to the whole. Those Commentators, who have considered this text apart from its true connexion, have left great scope to their own fancies and imaginations in interpreting it. But a just regard to the connexion will in all probability tie us down to its precise meaning.

I. It is plain, that the view the apostle had in writing this epistle, was to keep the believing Hebrews from apostatising to Judaism, notwithstanding the persecutions they actually underwent, or apprehended, from their continuing to profess the Christian religion. This he had done from the very beginning of the epistle; by shewing them, that Christianity is infinitely preferable to Judaism, in every point in which they differ: Christianity having Jesus for its Author, who is higher than the angels, both in His relation to God, chap. i., and in dominion, chap. ii.; superior to Moses, chap. iii.; of a more excellent order of high priesthood than Aaron, chap. iv.—x.; and having, by the once offering of Himself to God in the heavens, for ever perfected them that believe, chap. x. 1—18.

The apostle, from all this, exhorts the Christian Hebrews, "to hold fast their profession without wavering," chap. x. 23, "and not to

cast away their confidence, which had a great recompense of reward," ver. 35; but withal tells them, that the only way to hold fast their profession, and not to cast away their confidence, is "the full assurance of faith," ver. 19—23, "and to live by it," ver. 35—39. He then describes what that faith is, chap. xi. 1; and shews, how such a faith, as is there described, had carried Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, to wait with patience, under many difficulties and trials, for the performance of the promise of an heavenly city in an heavenly country, ver. 9, 10 (the promise, κατ' ἐξοχήν). This heavenly country was promised to Abraham, Gen. xvii. 8, 9, under the expression of "the everlasting possession of Canaan." Nothing less than an heavenly, paradisaical country, can become an everlasting possession. And we may well suppose, that an heavenly city either was couched under the expression, of an everlasting possession of Canaan, or accompanied it; since the apostle here says, that "God would have been ashamed to have been called their God (as He first called Himself, when He made the promise, Gen. xvii. 8, 9), if He had not prepared for them a city;" and which He likewise must have promised to them, since we find that they expected it, chap. xi. The apostle afterwards says, that all these three

patriarchs, "fellow-heirs of the same promise,"[1] ver. 9, (of the promise, κατ' ἐξοχήν,) "died in faith; not having received the promises;" that is, the things promised, or either of them: namely, either the thing promised, Gen. xv. 18—21, which was the reversionary inheritance of the earthly Canaan in the fourth generation; or the thing promised, κατ' ἐξοχήν, namely, Gen. xvii. 8, 9; which was the heavenly country, under the terms of Canaan for an everlasting possession, and, as may well be inferred, the heavenly city in it. To shew the faith of those three patriarchs in this last promise, and the high value they had for it (though they only saw it afar off; not so near as the second, third, or fourth generations, as they saw the earthly Canaan, which was the thing promised, Gen. xv. 18—22), they chose to live in tents, in this very country, where they had no possession, rather than return to the possessions of their

[1] Isaac and Jacob are called here "fellow-heirs (συγκληρονόμοι) of the same promise;" because the same promise was made to them of Canaan as an everlasting possession, as had been made to Abraham, and because they were the only persons to whom the promise was made. See Gen. xxvi. 5, and xxviii. 3—5, where the meaning of the promise, that "In thee shall all the nations of the earth be blessed," is, that in imitating thee, they shall have the blessing of the everlasting possession as well as thyself. See Rom. iv. 13—16. Gal. iii. 16—29.

own, or build a city in this land of their pilgrimage, ver. 9, 10. 13. 16. The apostle then goes on to other worthies of their nation, Gideon, Barak, Sampson, David, Samuel, the prophets, and even down so low as the seven sons in the Maccabees; and of all these he affirms, that they, "through faith, obtained a good report" (as well as the elders, ver. 2), but "received not the promise;" that is, the thing promised (or the thing promised, κατ' ἐξοχήν), namely, the heavenly city in the heavenly country, promised to Abraham and his fellow-heirs, Gen. xvii. 8, 9. It is said, they received not the *promise;* that is, the thing promised (but it is not said of these last, as it was of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that they received not the *promises;* that is, the things promised; because these last had received one of them; namely, that of the earthly Canaan). The apostle then adds the reason why they had not received the thing promised, κατ' ἐξοχήν; or the heavenly Canaan; "God having provided some better thing (namely, heaven, or the third heavens) for us (namely, Christians, both Jews and Gentiles, far better than this heavenly city in the heavenly country), that (so) they (Jews) without us (Christians) should (or might) not be made perfect," ver. 32—40.

He then goes on to give them the example of Jesus, the Director and Finisher of the Christian

race (ἄρχηγον καὶ τελειώτην), chap. xii. ver. 1—4, and tells the Christian Hebrews, that though God, as a Father, "had chastened them," yet He had not "called them to resist unto blood," as He had Jesus, the High-priest of their profession, and many of the heroes of the Jewish nation, mentioned in the former chapter, ver. 4—15, who yet died in the faith of the promised reward and inheritance.

He finally sets before them an example of another nature; namely, of Esau, a profane person; who despised this heavenly inheritance, and that earthly inheritance or birthright, which was a pledge of it; and who, after he had once thoroughly despised, could never recover it, ver. 15—18.

After saying all this to them, he now comes to tell them more particularly what this inheritance is, which their ancestors had lived and died in the faith of, the better to animate these Christian Hebrews to persevere in their open profession of Christianity, through the hope of the inheritance. To this purpose, he compares some circumstances of the state in which they were to expect their heavenly inheritance, with the circumstances of the greatest pomp and majesty, that occurred at the giving of the law; of which they made their boasts, and to which they were too willing to return: shewing them, that the circumstances of pomp

and majesty that would attend that state, which all their pious ancestors expected as their reward and inheritance; and which would be theirs too, if they held fast their profession without wavering; would be far greater than those which attended the giving of the law: putting them also in mind of the circumstances of great terror, that had accompanied all that grandeur and majesty which appeared at the giving of the law, ver. 18—22, and at the same time intimating, that there would be no such terror attending the majestic disposition of things in that state, in which, in case they persevered, they would have their recompense of reward. He also takes care to let them know, that they were "come" to this heavenly inheritance; whereas Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob only "saw it afar off." The meaning of their being *come* to the particulars mentioned, is, that this inheritance was not only more fully opened and described, but was much better secured to them, by the farther promise, that Christ and His apostles had made of it, by the resurrection of Christ from the dead, by the promise of their resurrection to it; and by all the farther assurances of their resurrection to it, which they had obtained through Christ's being the Christian Sacrifice and High-priest; than it had been to any of their ancestors. All these particularities and assurances of this inheritance

being so much greater than the particularities and assurances that had been given to the patriarchs, and other good men of that nation, before Christ; the Hebrew Christians might well be said to *come* to it, in comparison of any that had gone before them. The figure here used is the same which runs through several other expressions of the New Testament; as Christians being "quickened or raised, justified, saved, and seated with Christ Jesus in heavenly places:" expressions peculiar to Christians, and made use of to shew, how much securer Christians might be of their resurrection, justification, salvation, and sitting with Christ in heaven, than the patriarchs and other good men of the Jewish nation could be of their resurrection, final acquittal, and salvation, before Christianity appeared in the world.

II. This I think is the connexion. As to the meaning of all the particulars that are here mentioned, from ver. 22—25, and to which the Christian Hebrews are said to be *come;* I apprehend it is in general a description of "the heavenly city in the heavenly country;" or, "the rest that remained for the people of God," chap. iv.; or, of "the city which hath foundations, whose Maker and Builder is God," which the patriarchs "saw afar off," chap. xi. 10. 15, 16, "the continuing city," which he exhorts them to seek, chap. xii. 13. And as to the distinct

meaning of each of these particulars, I will endeavour to explain it, as each stands in the text.

" You are come unto Mount Sion, and the city of the living God :" that is, to a beautiful mountain, secured by a city, in a cultivated and pleasant country, defended by its natural situation, Psal. lxviii. 2—14. cxxv. 2. xlviii. 1—3. 12, 13, from whence God mildly and graciously shone forth; as an emblem and pledge of his favour, in pardoning sins, hearing prayers, and bestowing blessings, Psal. xxi. See also Rev. xi. 19. xxi. 5. All this is fairly implied of Mount Sion, as Mount Sion is described in the Old Testament; and as it stands opposed to Mount Sinai; a vast mountain, in an open and defenceless, howling wilderness; see Exod. xvii. 8; terrible in itself; more terrible from God's breaking forth out of the fire and thick darkness that covered the top of it, out of the earthquake that shook it, and out of the tempest, the thunder, and lightning, that were about it, in a voice of words, which they that heard, desired they might never hear any more: but most terrible of all, by its being not to be touched, but upon pain of death: though it was a mountain as tangible in its own nature as any other, ver. 18—20, and for that reason styled " the mount that might be touched." Other cities were the cities of idols; that is, of dead heroes, or of mortal princes; but

this only was the city "of the living God," or "of the great King," Matt. v. 35.

"The heavenly Jerusalem." This is added still to shew more expressly what the city of the living God here meant is: a city indeed of "righteousness and peace," Heb. vii. 2. Rev. xxi. 27. Psal. cxlvii. 14, whence the earthly Jerusalem had its name: but not the earthly Jerusalem itself, the "uncontinuing city," which they knew, and which he exhorts them to leave, chap. xiii. 13, and of which many of their ancestors had been citizens; but the heavenly one, or the Jerusalem coming down from heaven, Rev. xxi. 2, which, He says, "we seek as a city to come," Heb. xii. 14, where the πολίτευμα of believing Jews and Gentiles is, Phil. iii. 20. And by St. John's describing this city, as he does, Rev. xxi. 1, we may see, it is the very same that was foretold by the prophets, and expected by the Jewish nation; namely, "a city of sapphires and precious stones," Isai. liv. 12. Tob. xiii. 16. Heb. xi. 10. Nor is this heavenly city to be built on any spot of this present earth; but in an heavenly country, or a country from heaven; namely, Canaan, become the garden of God, according to the predictions of the prophets; where "instead of the thorn shall come up the fir-tree, and instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle-tree," Isai. lv. 13, "and when even the desert shall rejoice and

blossom as a rose; when it shall blossom abundantly, and rejoice with singing; and when the glory of Lebanon shall be given unto it, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon; when they shall see the glory of the Lord, and the excellency of our God," chap. xxxv. 1, 2, "and when there shall be no hurting or destroying in all His holy mountain," chap. vi. 10, lxv. 25. This is the city, and this the country, which will take place at "the restitution (or renovation) of all things" (to their original blessed state), and of which "God hath spoken, by the mouth of all His holy prophets, ever since the world began," Acts iii. 21. See Rev. xxi. 5. This is, in other prophetic words, "the mercy," which God raised up Christ, as an horn of salvation in the house of his servant David, "to perform to the fathers (Abraham, &c.) in remembrance of His holy covenant," Luke i. 72, 73 (ποιῆσαι ἔλεος). The mercy and covenant, that is, in other words, this heavenly city in an heavenly country, which all, that had obtained a good report, died in the faith of, though they had only seen them afar off, as our apostle calls it, Heb. xi. ult.; or, as he calls it, chap. iv. 9, "the rest (or the land of rest) that yet remained for the people of God;" and which, St. John tells us more particularly, is the "Jerusalem, that comes down from heaven," on the new earth, "like a bride adorned for

her husband," chap. xxxi. 1, 2. 10. The opposition, that Mount Sion and the heavenly Jerusalem are here put in to Mount Sinai, shews, that Mount Sion and the heavenly Jerusalem are to be understood literally of that very place, and that city; and not figuratively of any other place, or of the assembly that is to meet in it.[1]

Nor are you come barely to the twenty thousand angels, by which, as "the chariots of God," God descended on Mount Sinai (Psal. lxviii. 17), "by whose disposition the law was given," Acts vii. 53. Gal. iii. 19. But you are come to the whole host of God: "to myriads, or an innumerable company of angels, which no man can number."[2] They are said at this

[1] If any one shall after all contend, "that Mount Sion and the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem," signifies our consummate happiness in the third heavens; it will lie upon him to make it out, by some rules of speech, by other plain facts, or by contemporary writings, that that is the thing meant by those expressions; which in themselves are far from importing it, and of which consummate happiness in the third heavens we find no intimation before the preaching of Christ.

[2] What we render "twenty thousand," Psal. lxviii. 17, if literally rendered, would be "two myriads." But the apostle here says, We are come to "myriads of angels;" which is consequently more than "two myriads:" for, being indefinite, it is equal to an innumerable company of angels. So that the sense of the apostle should seem to be, that whereas there were but two myriads of angels that

very time, Dan. vii. 10, to be "a thousand thousand, and ten thousand times ten thousand." In Daniel's style, the time when the "everlasting dominion shall be given to one like the Son of man, and to the saints," ver. 13, 14. 27. The apostle here saying, We are come to "myriads of angels," shews, that this portion of Scripture relates to a state that is future. How otherwise could the Christian Hebrews be

made God's chariot at Mount Sinai, here there will be myriads of angels indefinitely, which is the same as an innumerable company of angels. This, I say, would seem to be the sense of the place, even if the place was to be pointed as it is in several of the Greek editions, in the common versions, and in ours in particular. But I suppose with Grotius, that the place should be pointed thus: καὶ μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων πανηγύρει, καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρωτοτόκων, &c.; which should be rendered, "and to the general assembly of angels, even to the myriads or ten thousands of them:" or, if we read, as the Clermont copy reads, καὶ μυρίων ἁγίων πανηγύρει, it should be rendered, "and to the general assembly of the ten thousands of holy ones." I think the comma should be at πανηγύρει, and not at ἀγγέλων, because in every other sentence, in this portion, καὶ, *and*, begins the sentence: and therefore I think the comma should be at πανηγύρει, that so the next sentence may begin with καὶ, as all the other sentences do, and as then that sentence will also; and run καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρωτοτόκων. Besides, I think πανηγύρει, καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρωτοτόκων, is in some sort a repetition; for what is the congregation but the general assembly? and what is the general assembly but the congregation? But the redundancy is avoided, if the comma be made at πανηγύρει, and not at ἀγγέλων.

said to be "*come* to a greater number" of angels, than attended at Mount Sinai? But when God will dwell again with men, as (we shall see presently) He will, in "the thousand years' reign" of the paradisaical state, there is no doubt but many myriads of angels will come with Him. For where the King is, there must his ministers and attendants be. And as He will then dwell with men, in a glorious manner that He has not yet done; He will then no doubt also be attended by a greater number of His holy ones, than He ever was. "He will then come, and all His saints with Him," Zech. xiv. 5.

Again; you are not come to the assembly and the church or congregation of the Israelites, who were all gathered together at the foot of Mount Sinai, in order to hear the law, Exod. xix. 17, and whose names were afterwards all written in the land of Canaan, in order to cast lots against them, for each man's inheritance, Josh. xv.—xxii., and who were on that account all considered as first-born: but you are come "to the general (or universal) assembly, and the church (or congregation) of (all) the first-born (both Jews and Gentiles), whose names are (now) written in heaven (or in the Lamb's book of life)," if they do not provoke God to blot them out, Exod. xxxii. 33, adopted to this inheritance, as the

sons of God, Gen. xvii. 7, 8. Rev. xx. 7. Now that all the first-born, that is, the heirs of God, shall have a share in the heavenly country and enter into the city, is plain, since the promise made to Abraham, that "he should be the heir of the world" (or the new world, or heavenly country, or Canaan, called κόσμος), was "through faith; that so it might be sure to all the seed; not only to that which is of the law, but to that also which is the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all," Rom. iv. 13. i. 6. Gal. iii. 16—29. And accordingly St. John tells us, that "he saw the souls of (all) them, that were beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God, and (of all) which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, nor had received his mark on their foreheads, or in their hands, and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. Blessed and holy is he, that hath part in the first resurrection! on such the second death shall have no power," Rev. xx. 4 (which, by the way too, is the promise that the Spirit makes to every one that overcometh, chap. ii. 11). I think it is fairly implied here, that they only are blessed and holy, in opposition to the wicked, who are cursed. And it follows, "and they shall be kings and priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with Him a thousand years." See chap. iii. 26, 27. This is the character of all

"the four and twenty elders;" that is, of all pro- "phets and apostles," and "of the four beasts;" that is, of the whole congregation of all true Israelites, represented by the four beasts or animals that were their standards when they encamped. For St. John says, "They sung a new hymn;" that is, the twenty-four elders and the four beasts; "saying, Thou (the Lamb) art worthy to open the book: for thou hast made us unto our God, kings and priests; and we shall reign on the earth," chap. iv. 9, 10. The Spirit likewise promiseth paradise to him that overcometh, Rev. iii. 7. And Jesus Himself says, "Blessed (and only blessed) are they (or all they) that do His commandments; that they may have a right to enter through the gates of the city (namely, the holy city of Jerusalem, that "cometh down from heaven on the new earth," chap. xxi. 1, 2. 10). For without are dogs," &c. chap. xxii. 14, 15. "And into this city nothing enters that defileth; but they (only, and all they) which are written in the Lamb's book of life," chap. xxi. 27. And finally, "He that sitteth upon the throne," and says, "Behold, I make all things new;" also says, "he that overcometh, shall inherit all these things (πάντα ταῦτα; as the best reading is, see Mills in loc., and as the sense absolutely requires): and I will be his God, and he shall be my son," Rev. xxi. 5. 7.

This general assembly being distinguished from "the heavenly Jerusalem, and the city of the living God," as that is from Mount Sion, may farther serve to shew us, that the "heavenly Jerusalem, the city of the living God," and Mount Sion, are to be taken literally, for a mountain in the city of Jerusalem, and not figuratively, for the general assembly itself, or for heaven, or for any other place, where that assembly may be supposed to meet.

This may also farther serve to shew us, that these verses relate to a state that is future. For the Hebrew Christians could not be yet said literally to be *come* to the general or universal "assembly of the congregation of the first-born, whose names are written in heaven." That assembly can never meet before the first resurrection.

Moreover, you are not come (as Moses and the children of Israel) only to the Angel (or God's Representative) who spake to him and them in the wilderness, and gave them the law, Acts vii. 38, and sometimes acted as immediate Judge, by cutting off transgressors; "but you are come to God (Himself) the Judge (κριτῆς, both the Judge and Governor) of all." So κριτῆς is used by the LXX; and in this sense the word Judge is used in our version: the book of Judges; that is, the book of Governors. And the Hebrew Christians are

properly said to be *come* to God, as their Judge and Governor, in the paradisaical state: for the throne of judgment is said to be set, Dan. vii. 9. 13. Rev. xx. 4. And when Jerusalem, the holy city, comes down out of heaven, "God will dwell with men, and will be their God (or King), and they shall be His people," Rev. xxi. 3; "And the Lord God Almighty (as well as) the Lamb will be the Temple thereof," ver. 22. And xxii. 4, "And behold the Tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them; and they shall be His people, and God Himself shall be with them, and be their God; and they shall see His face, and His name shall be in their foreheads."

Farther; you are not come to "Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of the children of Israel," the first Synedrion, or great council of the Israelites, who were admitted to approach nigher to the Shechinah than the rest of the people; "going up into the mount, and seeing the Lord God of Israel, and eating and drinking before Him," Exod. xxiv. 1, 2—12; but you are come to the spirits of those who are brought yet nigher to God than they; having received more glorious communications from Him than "Moses, Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, and the seventy elders." You are come "to the spirits of just men that are perfected" (πνεύμασι δικαίων τετε-

λειωμένων); [1] namely, by the illumination of the Spirit, the true Shecinah (δόξα) of the New Testament, 2 Cor. iii. Those spirits of just men, that were thus perfect, were in all probability the spirits of the prophets and apostles, who had the nearest intercourse with God. And most probably it is these prophets and apostles, that are designed by the twenty-four elders in the Revelation, that are there described as nigher to God's throne, corresponding to the priests in the encampment of Israel (who were afterwards cast into twenty-four courses), than the four beasts; that is, than the congregation of God's people. The reason why the prophets and apostles are said to be twenty-four, perhaps, is, that as the Jews used to reckon but twelve minor prophets (Daniel not being reckoned one by them), so Jesus appointed at first but twelve apostles. (See apostles and prophets thus coupled together, Rev. xviii. 20. Luke xi. 47.) Perhaps, "the spirits of just men that are perfect," may signify the spirits of the apostles and the prophets of the New Testament, though represented by the minor prophets of the Old Testament; particularly the one hundred and twenty, who are called "the apostles' company," Acts iv. 23,

[1] To shew that τετελειωμένων has this sense, see 1 Cor. ii. 6, σοφίαν δὲ λαλοῦμεν ἐν τοῖς τελείοις.

and who were the first Christian Synedrion, or great council; consisting of the apostles and elders, in contradistinction to the brethren[1] (who were all full of the Holy Ghost, and probably prophets and teachers, such as Judas and Silas, Acts xv. 32); and who are mentioned as thus contradistinguished from the brethren, and as met together to consult and debate of an affair of great importance to the church,[2] Acts xv. 6. 23. And I apprehend, that the reason why the apostle says, "and to the *spirits* of just men made perfect," is because in the paradisaical state the bodies of just men will not be perfected; they not being to receive their celestial, glorious, spiritual, and incorruptible bodies, till the end of the paradisaical (and which I think is but an animal) state; when they are to enter on that which is most properly their celestial and spiritual state, and shall be translated to the third heavens.

Finally; you are not come to Moses (who, though "the faithful servant of the Lord," yet offended at Massah and Meribah) "the mediator of the old covenant," Gal. iii. 19, 20, who,

[1] The Cambr. Ms. is ὄντες πλήρεις πνεύματος ἁγίου. That shews they were of the CXX, and therefore called ἄνδρες ἡγούμενοι, ver. 22. Such prophets and teachers are mentioned, Acts xiii. 1.

[2] See Episcop. Hor. Hebraic.

after he had been up in the mount with God, came down again, and sprinkled the blood of the beasts which he had slain, on the people, Exod. xxiv. 2, 3. 12, to the purification of their flesh, ver. 5—9, but to "Jesus, the Righteous, the Son of God, the Mediator of the new (and better) covenant; by whose blood ye are sprinkled from an evil conscience," Hebr. x. 22; a blood, "that speaketh better things than (even that of) righteous Abel" (the first sacrifice to malice and envy), which cried for vengeance, Gen. iv. 10, while Jesus prayed for forgiveness for his murderers, when His was spilling upon the cross, Luke xxiii. 34, and who is since risen, and ever liveth to make intercession for His people, and to dispense the blessings of pardon and peace to them. Now that we shall come to the Mediator of the new covenant, in the paradisaical state of the 1000 years' reign, is plain; since it is the illustrious and happy state of the Mediator's kingdom, Dan. ii. 44, 45. vii. 13, 14. And Jesus promises to him that overcometh, that "He will grant to him to sit down on His throne, as He overcame, and sat down on His Father's throne," Rev. iii. 21. And this promise must relate to the paradisaical state. For in the truly celestial state, at the consummation of all things, Christ is to "give up all power to God, even the Father, that so He may be all in all," 1 Cor. xv. 28.

I flatter myself, from what has been said under several of the particulars of the text, which have been here explained, that the reader is by this time almost ready to concur in opinion with me, that the state described by them, is neither the present state of the gospel, which obtained when this epistle was written, nor yet that in which it will be wound up at the consummation of all things; but a paradisaical state (at the restitution of all things to their original state "in the new heavens and the new earth)," which will take place between the two other. However, to convince him more fully of this point, without giving him the trouble to look back to what has been said under each of those particulars, it may not be improper to gather those broken considerations together, and to lay them before him in one short view.

"Mount Sion, the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, the innumerable company of angels, the general assembly and church of the first-born," which are the five first particulars (either considered in their expression, or in their opposition to the things that occurred at giving the law), cannot signify the present state, or the truly celestial state: nor, if they signify the present state, could the Hebrew Christians have been said, in any tolerable sense, to be *come* to the two last of them.

"The spirits of just men made perfect, Jesus

the Mediator of the new covenant, and the blood of sprinkling," which are the seventh, eighth and ninth particulars, do not agree to the truly celestial state. But all these, namely, the five or three first, and the three last, as well as the sixth (which indeed may belong to all), agree well with the paradisaical state, and therefore must all be supposed to belong to it.

III. Every one that reads the text, that I have been explaining, will presently observe, that the order, in which things are represented, ver. 22—25, seems to be strangely disturbed and perplexed. It has been hitherto thought so little to be accounted for, that I do not remember any critic or commentator who has so much as attempted it. That excellent Scripture-critic, Dr. Clarke, to support the sense he has given to the text, has quite broken the order of it;[1] which shews he wanted a true key to it. But a general observation that I have made, and

[1] See Dr. Clarke's Sermon on this text, vol. iv. The order, in which the Doctor discourses of these particulars is, I. Mount Sion and the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, as a royal city. II. The rest of the particulars, of which he discourses, as the constituent members of that city: 1. God the Judge of all. 2. The Mediator of the new covenant: and then gives a reason why the Spirit is not mentioned; which, if it had been a good reason, might shew, that the Mediator would not have been mentioned neither.

the explication I have given of each of these verses, will easily let us into the reason of the order which the Apostle observes here; and will at the same time help to convince every one, that duly considers it, that what I have given as the interpretation of the verses, cannot be very remote from the sense of the author of them. The observation I refer to is this: that the description the Apostle makes of this paradisaical state, is by way of opposition to the most majestic circumstances that attended the giving of the law. From thence it is, that the particulars, by which he describes "the heavenly inheritance" (which, he says, the Hebrew Christians were come to), are ranged in the order they are; precisely answering to the order in which the most remarkable particulars occurred at the giving of the law. This will

For there will be no more occasion for the Mediator in heaven than for the Paraclete. 3. The innumerable company of angels. 4. The spirits of just men made perfect, namely, in heaven, where yet no unembodied spirits ever were, or shall be. 5. The general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven. Whereas the order of the text is nine, or, if you will, six particulars: and of those the Doctor's first under his second general head is the Apostle's fourth; the Doctor's second is the Apostle's ninth; the Doctor's third is the Apostle's second; the Doctor's fourth is the Apostle's seventh; and the Doctor's last is the Apostle's fifth.

appear by setting those down as they occurred in order of time and place, in that history, on one side; and the particulars, as they occur in this text, on the other: only taking the liberty to reduce the nine particulars, mentioned by the Apostle, to six, for the greater perspicuity.

Things in the order of Time and Place in which they occur at the Giving of the Law, Exod. xix—xxv.	Things in the order of Place in which they occur in the Text; namely, Heb. xii. 22—25.
1. Mount Sinai in the wilderness; one of the worst spots of this earth in its state under the curse; far behind any city, particularly the earthly or uncontinuing city of the earthly Canaan (out of which yet the Christian Hebrews are exhorted to go, Heb. xii. 13, 14), as much as that excelled the cities of any dead heroes, or mortal kings.	1. "Mount Sion in the city of the living God," the heavenly or abiding Jerusalem (to come, Heb. xii. 14), to be fixed in Canaan, become an heavenly country; far excelling the earthly Jerusalem in the earthly Canaan, and even the first paradise itself; that being a garden without a city.
2. Twenty thousand angels, at the giving of the law, forming the thick darkness, the fire, the tempest, the earthquake, the thunder, the lightning, the sound of a trumpet, and the chariots of God, Psal. lxviii. 17, 18.	2. "Myriads (or an innumerable company) of angels:" being, as Daniel reckons them at this very time (in his style, the time when the "fourth beast shall be given to the burning flame," and an "everlasting dominion shall be given to one like the Son of man, and to the saints," chap. vii. 13, 14. 27), "a thousand thousand, and ten thousand times ten thousand," ver. 10.

3. The whole congregation of Israel assembled at the foot of Mount Sinai (Exod. xix. 17. Deut. ix. 10), whose names were all written afterwards in the land of Canaan; in order to their receiving an inheritance by lot, as though they had been all first-born, Josh. xv—xx.

3. "The general assembly of the first-born (heirs of God) whose names are written in heaven."

4. God's Angel, or Representative, descending on Mount Sinai, as Governor of the Israelites, in order to give the law, Psal. lxviii. 17, 18, compared with Eph. iv. 9, and in some cases judging (and punishing) them immediately. See Numb. xv. 37, 38. xvi. 31—50.

4. God, the Governor of all men, "both Jews and Gentiles," judging the saints, and dwelling with them in paradise, becoming "their God (or King), and they becoming His people," Rev. xx. 41. xxi. 3; and, at the end of a thousand years, judging the wicked, Rev. xx. 11—15.

5. Moses, Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of the children of Israel, going up into some part of the mount, seeing the Lord God of Israel (the Shecinah of the Old Testament); and eating and drinking in His presence (the first Synedrion or great council of the Israelites), while the people were kept at a distance, Exod. xxiv. 1, 2. 9, 10, 11.[1]

5. "The spirits of just men made perfect," by the greatest communication with God; namely, by the illumination of the Spirit (the true Shecinah of the New Testament); particularly the CXX: consisting of the "apostles and elders" (who had the greatest portion of the choicest gifts of the Spirit), composing the first Synedrion, or great council of Christians (dis-

[1] The 9th, 10th and 11th verses should follow the 1st and 2d, and so make the 3d, 4th and 5th: and then that which now stands the 3d verse should be the 6th; the 4th should be the 7th; the 5th should be the 8th; the 6th the 9th; the 7th should be the 10th; the 8th the 11th; and that which is now the 12th should follow; and so on, as they now stand, to the end of the chapter. That there is such a transposition, and that this is the way to set

tinct from the brethren), met together to consult, Acts xv. 6. 23, though the brethren are present at the debate, and afterwards join in the resolution that was taken, ver. 12. 22, 23.

6. "Moses, the faithful servant of the Lord" (yet offending at Massah and Meribah), the mediator of the old covenant, Gal. iii. 19, 20, sprinkling the blood of the beasts that he had slain on the people, Exod. xxiv. 5—9, to the purification of the flesh, Heb. ix. 13.

6. "Jesus, the Righteous, the Son of God, the Mediator of the new (and better) covenant," by whose blood (spilt by the imitators of Cain, 1 John iii. 10—13) "we are sprinkled from an evil conscience," Heb. x. 22, "and whose blood speaks better things than (even) that of (righteous) Abel," that fell a sacrifice to Cain, the first child of the devil, 1 John iii. 10—13.

IV. The exhortation couched in all this long connexion, and in these passages thus explained, both as to their meaning and their order, is this: Live by faith! the faith that I have described, and of which I have given you such illustrious examples, chap. xi. and xii.; and then you will not, by preferring your ease and security to your heavenly inheritance, lose it, through a like contempt of it as Esau formerly shewed of his heavenly inheritance, and of that birthright which was the pledge of it. But, on the other hand, being so much more fully informed of the

it right, will evidently appear to any one that reads that chapter; and may farther appear by the order in which these particulars are ranged in this text.

particulars of your heavenly inheritance, and so much better assured of possessing it, than any of your ancestors ever were; particularly on seeing that the grandeur and glory of that state, in which you are to have your inheritance, will so greatly exceed the most majestic circumstances that appeared at the giving of the law; and without any of that terror which made the most majestic circumstance at the giving the law; I say, on all this fuller information and assurance of these several particulars of your inheritance, you will undoubtedly endure the contradiction of sinners, in some measure, as Jesus, the Director and Rewarder of your Christian course, did (who had the joy, that was to be His recompense, immediately set before Him, as you have in some sort yours); and will at least most assuredly hold out full as well as those heroes of your nation did, who bore great trials, in hope of this inheritance; though they only saw it indistinctly, and afar off: especially, since God has not yet called you "to resist unto blood," as He has Jesus, and many of that cloud of witnesses which encompasses you.

LETTERS

BETWEEN

LORD BARRINGTON AND DR. LARDNER,

ON SEVERAL OF

THE SUBJECTS OF THE PRECEDING ESSAYS.

LETTERS, &c.

Lord Barrington to Dr. Lardner.

Becket House, Dec. 18th, 1727.

SECTION I.—*Lord Barrington compliments Dr. Lardner on his candour and penetration.*

Rev. Sir,—I am very much obliged to you for the objections you have proposed against the *Essay on the Dispensations of God to Mankind;* having been hitherto very much in the way of thinking that runs through that Essay: not only as to the method in which the author apprehends revelation in general should be considered, but in the main as to what he says about the several dispensations of God to mankind.

As I have wanted an objector, therefore, to shew me where I was in the wrong, or to confirm me if I was in the right, by seeing that his objections would not hold; so I cannot wish

for a better than yourself. Your great abilities instead of suffering you ever to mistake the question, enable you to discern every weak part that is brought to support it. Your modesty makes you propose the strongest objections rather "in the method of inquiry than of argument." Your candour and equity leads you to profess a great value for the treatise, which is to be the subject of your criticism; and your undeserved esteem for me will have it "that it is from me you are to expect a satisfactory answer." The sentiments you entertain of the book and of me, together with your known talents and dispositions, insure me all the instruction that can possibly arise from a correspondent on the weighty subject that is before us.

SECTION II.—*On the opinions entertained by the patriarchs and prophets respecting a future state.*

You allow with the *author* "that God had all along a view to the great design of the Gospel dispensation, and that the spiritual and heavenly blessings, to be bestowed through Christ Jesus, were intended and included in the curse pronounced on the serpent, the blessing of *Shem*, the "promise made to *Abraham*, and the kingdom of David."—But you think the author goes too far, when he imagines, "that any

of these persons were led to the thought of any spiritual or heavenly blessings;" though you also own, that as low down as the later prophets, and after them, it is likely good men had such thoughts and expectations.

I have been for about five or six months past in part of your opinion: for I have thought the *author* went too far in supposing, that either God gave intimations, or that good men were led to the thought of HEAVENLY *blessings*, before the revelation of Jesus Christ. But I still think, there were plain intimations of spiritual blessings and of a future life.

That I may open myself fully to you, I own I have been for these five or six months past of opinion, that from the fall to the time of Christ there was no revelation of the *heavenly* happiness after life; that is to say, of the being translated to the third heaven, where God is represented as on a throne, where Christ is, and where the blessed angels are; or of a resurrection in a spiritual, immortal, powerful, glorious, celestial, body. But yet I think God gave plain intimations to the *patriarchs* before *Abraham*, and an express revelation to him, of a resurrection to a future immortality. But I now withal suppose, that all that the *patriarchs* before *Abraham* expected, was a resurrection to some such state as the garden of *Eden:* and that God expressly revealed to *Abraham*, that he and his

seed, that is, such as should imitate him in his faith and obedience, should be raised up to enjoy *Canaan for an everlasting possession.*

SECTION III.—*Lord Barrington advocates the method of the Caraites, and condemns mystical senses of Scripture.*

I own that as far as the author has given a larger sense of any text either in the Old or New Testament, than the words in the connexion they stand do express, in support of any thing he has said, he fails in proof. I am against all mystical senses of Scripture. I am a *Caraite* for the letter of Scripture, and that alone: understood, however, not barely in the grammatical, but in the critical sense of the place. When we leave the letter of Scripture, as I have now explained it, for any other meaning, I am sensible we launch into a boundless, unfathomable ocean, without any compass or rudder to steer by.

I take it for granted, however, when I say this, that you will not expect such letter of Scripture, as one ought, in case the part of Scripture I am considering was a system of doctrine: but such letter of Scripture as may be expected from a short history, written by a Hebrew leader for the instruction of the people he led, and with the main facts of which they were well acquainted by tradition before. I

must desire you would take the trouble to cast your eyes on Essay, p. 368—371, where my sense of this matter is expressed fully. I promise myself, that you will not think this hint unbecoming of a *Caraite* writing to a *Caraite*. Such I take you to be. If I did not, I should hope for little from this correspondence.

If therefore the letter of Scripture, as thus explained, fails our author, every thing fails him. But I cannot entirely say the same, if there are not facts to support his sense of the letter of the text. Yet I acknowledge that, on the one hand, it will be a great prejudice against his scheme, if there are no such facts; as, on the other hand, that it will be a very great confirmation of his scheme, if there are. The probability therefore of his scheme will rise the higher, or sink the lower, in proportion to the passages, where an expectation of future happiness is expressed either more clearly or more obscurely; or to there being no such passages to be produced.

SECTION IV.—*On the sense in which the expressions "Son of God" and "likeness of God" are to be understood.*

Adam undoubtedly knew, that God had formed him, though it was but out of the dust of the earth. This we may be assured, since *Moses* could not know it as a *historian*, but only

by tradition from him: and it is plain that *Moses* writes the history of *Genesis* in the character of a *historian*, and not in the character of a *prophet*, or of one that received his materials by revelation from God; as if *St. Paul* received his gospel from Christ; or as *St. John* received his *revelations* from Christ, the Angel, or the Spirit; when he was ordered *to write the things which he had seen, and the things that are, as well as those, that should be hereafter*, Rev. i. 1. x. 19. *Adam* could not but know, that God had given him *dominion;* since God expressly and immediately blessed him with it, *Gen.* i. 28. If He had a *glory* for a garment of dignity, and as a badge of His dominion, He could not but see that He had it: and that He had it, I think will appear highly probable, from this consideration, that we find it to be the garment of all the sons of God, either by creation, adoption, or generation: and that it is a garment suitable to so high and near a relation to the *God and Father of glory*, who is *Light, and dwells in it.* I must also beg you will turn your eye to Essay, section iii. page 398, and to the texts quoted, pp. 402—405. I must likewise desire you to add to those texts Phil. xi. 7, 8, where *form of God*, is opposed to the *form of a servant*, or a slave; i. e. of one that is not entitled to an inheritance. I apprehend *St. Paul* expresses this notion *Rom.* viii. 3, by Christ's being IN THE LIKENESS OF

SINFUL FLESH: or else I do not well see what that expression means. Besides, *Adam* found that God was so gracious, as to put him in possession of the *blissful garden of Eden*, and to shew him the *tree of life* there, as that which would make him *immortal;* though, in his constitution and frame, he was only taken *out of the dust*, and consequently made a mortal, corruptible man; or, as *St. Paul* expresses it, a *living soul*, by the *breath of life*, that *God had breathed into his nostrils*. By all this *Adam* must know from the nature of things, that God was his Father: having been, as we see, produced by God, so as to have no other father; having been made in His image and likeness, and that both in his moral perfections, and also in such of his natural perfections as may be considered as *Adam's* inheritance as a Son of *God*. And that this is the meaning of the expressions in *Genesis*, of *his being made in the likeness of God, in His own image*, does not only appear from the expressions themselves, and the explication that is given of them, *Gen.* i. 26. 28; but from the use that is made of *likeness* and *image* in the farther sequel of the history; for *Moses* acquaints us that *Adam* begat *Seth* IN HIS OWN LIKENESS, AFTER HIS IMAGE, Gen. v. 3. Can it be supposed, that an accurate writer, as *Moses* is, when he had said, that God created man *in His own likeness, after His image*, Gen. i. 26, 27, and here says, that

Adam begat Seth IN HIS OWN LIKENESS, AFTER HIS IMAGE, did not set this expression in opposition to the other? Nothing less appears from the words being so exactly repeated. He must therefore design to acquaint us, that *Adam*, having lost the image and likeness of God, could not for that reason beget Seth after that image and likeness, or an heir of dominion, of glory, as a badge of it, the possession of a blissful garden, and of the tree of life; but *in his own likeness after his image;* a miserable, mortal man like himself; an heir of his toil, care, sorrow, and death. That *Moses* would give us to understand this by these expressions, appears to me still the more likely, considering how it is introduced. He gives us an account, chap. iv., of *Abel's* being murdered by *Cain*, and of Cain's descendants; and then adds, v. 25, that *Adam knew Eve his wife again, and that she bore him a son, and called his name Seth; for God, said she, hath appointed me another* SEED *instead of* (righteous) *Abel, whom Cain slew.* He then gives us an account of Adam's descendants by *Seth*, chap. v., from whom the children of *Israel* came; and says, *This is the book of the generation of Adam.* (For *Cain* was not reckoned as his seed, but *Abel*, and *Seth*, whom God gave him, as a seed instead of ABEL; as *Shem* was afterwards *Noah's:* and it was said to *Abraham*, In *Isaac shall thy seed be called.*) *In the day that God crea-*

ted man, in the likeness of God made He him, male and female created He them, and blessed them, and called their name Adam, in the day when they were created. Thus it should be stopped. The stopping in our version has somewhat disturbed the sense. *And Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat a son* (viz. SETH) IN HIS OWN LIKENESS, AFTER HIS OWN IMAGE, *and called his name Seth.* If one only considers what *Moses* had said, Gen. i. 26, 27, can one think that by this expression here he only means, that *Adam "had begot a man in miniature;"* especially when one considers all this repetition, and that in a concise and accurate historian? Or rather, can this serve for any thing less, than to let the children of *Israel* know (for whose use he writ this history), lest they should have forgot what he had said, chap. i. 26, 27, that though they came from *Seth*, who was the son that God gave *Adam* instead of righteous Abel, and not from wicked *Cain;* yet they were not to have too high a notion of their ancestor; for that *Seth* was but a mortal and miserable man like themselves, begot by *Adam* in his OWN likeness, after his OWN *image*, since the fall; *and not in the likeness of God, and after His image*, as *Adam* was *created;* and as he would have begot *Seth*, as well as his other children, if he had preserved his innocence? And to this sense of *Adam's* begetting a son after his own

image, *St. Paul* plainly alludes, when he speaks of Christ as the second *Adam*, 1 Cor. xv. 45, and says, v. 44, *That as we have borne the* IMAGE *of the* EARTHY ADAM (viz. in a mortal body); *so we shall* BEAR THE IMAGE OF THE HEAVENLY. And Rom. viii. 29. So that *St. Paul* must have understood this phraseology of *Moses* in the sense I have here given of it. And from this use of likeness and image in *Genesis*, it is, that, in my opinion, *image of God* signifies almost every where in the New Testament "the representation of God's dominion;" as 1 Cor. xi. 6. 2 Cor. iv. 4. Coloss. i. 15. See also Ecclesiasticus xvii. 1. 10.

Thus *Adam's* sonship is strictly founded in the nature of things. And *Luke* iii. ult. is brought but as a short and additional proof of that which flows from the circumstances of *Adam's* creation; and by which therefore *St. Luke's* expression is to be explained. I agree with you that St. Luke's expression immediately shews, "That whilst others, mentioned in Christ's genealogy, had a parent, *Adam* came immediately out of the hand of God." But there must be more implied; for if every thing that came immediately out of the hand of God was a son of God, not only the inanimate and brute part of the creation must have the honour of that relation; but even the wicked *angels*, and *Adam*, immediately after his fall. The ex-

pression therefore must imply, that *Adam*, who was immediately produced by God, did also resemble God in his moral excellencies, and in some of His high natural perfections, and in the glory and bliss that results from them; or, in other words, that he had an inheritance from Him, becoming *a son of God*. And from hence it is, that *a son of God* in Scripture ever afterwards implies a resemblance of God in His moral image, and in dominion, and (unless it be in the case of princes, which indeed stops there) in the farther inheritance also of glory, bliss, and immortality. Thus, you see, I found my notion of *Adam's* filial relation to God, in the nature of things, in the expressions in *Genesis*, and in the constant use of the expression *son of God* in Scripture, as well as in the text quoted from the third chapter of *St. Luke's* gospel in particular. And though this long train of reasoning may look here like a far-fetched thing; yet it only looks so, from our having now lost the language that prevailed then, and was then well understood:—I mean our not understanding what is meant by the terms *God*, *image*, and *likeness of God;* from which all this train of reasoning flows: and flows, as reasoning ought to do, when it is to be drawn from a concise and accurate history; especially when it records what God has said, who must ever be supposed to speak with point and emphasis:—and in that

method of reasoning I may venture to assert, to one so knowing in the Bible as yourself, that, on a careful examination, it will be found, I have the New Testament writers for my example, when they make quotations from the Old: though they have been treated for this, by such as look but superficially into the Bible, as only allegorical and cabalistical reasoners; that is, as not reasoning at all. Indeed all writers argue thus from a bottoming notion, as Mr. *Locke* calls it, when they argue either from history, law, or any other art or science. What arguments, for example, will not the best lawyer draw from *the crown of the realm's being an imperial crown*, or from *the law's being every Englishman's inheritance?*

As from what I have said, I flatter myself, you will allow, that *Adam* could not but know he was a *son of God* before the fall; so I cannot but think you will agree with me, that he could not but know, that by his sin and disobedience, he had lost that relation. He finds himself stript of the garment of a *son of God*, is naked, is afraid of God, runs away to hide himself, receives a curse from Him, (which must include the total removing of the blessing, and more,) is at last clothed with the skins of beasts, instead of the glory he had had for a garment of dignity and dominion, is driven out of *Paradise*, and sees the way to re-enter it effectually barred

against him. Here could be little room left for thinking himself a *son of God*. "The prolongation of the threatening" was but a reprieve: it was no pardon; nor could not reinstate him in his former privileges. The prolongation of his life in sorrow, toil, care, and in the expectation of death, is his sentence, and pronounced on him as such (though indeed a milder one than he might have expected); but sure his hopes could not arise from his sentence.

SECTION V.—*On the hopes entertained by Adam from the promise respecting "the seed of the woman."*

Yet I do not doubt but that *Adam* had hopes that God had restored him to His favour, Wisdom x. 12; and that though he was to die, yet he should be recovered from death, by the sentence that God had first pronounced on the serpent; viz. that one or more of his descendants should break the head of that very serpent, that had through his subtlety brought death upon them. For it is said, *the seed of the woman shall break* THY HEAD, Genesis iii. 15. *Adam must now know, that it was not a literal* serpent that had deceived his wife and him. He would have other notions of God, than to think He would erect a tribunal against a beast. He would by the sentence know that he was a *seraph*, if he did not know it before: and, by

this time, that he was a fallen seraph, or Satan; Job i. 7. ii. 1. Zach. iii. 1; or the devil, Wisdom ii. 2. 4; or the destroyer, as he is called, Exodus xii. 23. Psalm lxxviii. 49. Numbers xvi. 41. 48, compared with Wisdom xviii. 22, with 1 Cor. x. 10, and with Rev. ix. 11. What could he then understand by breaking HIS HEAD, but destroying his stratagem? or rather that which his stratagem brought about? That was death. And what could destroy the product of that stratagem, but a recovery from death? And he could not but be confirmed in his hopes of that recovery, by every favourable circumstance, either in the process, or in the sentence, against the three offenders; or in what followed after, in providing garments for two of them.

It would be natural for *Adam*, when he hoped for a recovery from death to immortality again, by the mercy and favour of his heavenly Father (at first by creation, and now by adoption), to expect, that though the way to the garden of *Eden* was barred against them in this life, that way would be opened to it, when he should recover from death. This was most likely to be his thought, upon his supposing that God designed to recover him from death, unless he had had a more particular and distinct revelation; and that was the hope that it was most natural for him to propagate to his posterity; if they would become like to God, in truth and purity,

justice and mercy; and not imitate the serpent, who was the father of malice and lies.

Nor could *Adam* fail of being confirmed in these hopes, and of confirming his posterity in them, by seeing the exemplary punishment inflicted on *Cain*, in a farther curse upon him, and the ground that he should till; which he would naturally consider as part of the lot and portion of being one of the seed (*i. e.* one of the imitators) of the serpent, as *Cain* was; and with whom they were to be at enmity. He would therefore, upon the whole, conclude that they were not the sons of God, but the children of God's great enemy, and that therefore a recovery from death to *Eden* would never be extended to them.

And what but this hope could make the children of *Seth*, in the second generation, begin *to call themselves by the name of the Lord, as their Father*, in opposition to the wicked family of *Cain*, that was cursed? and about the sixth generation, to go (as it should seem) by no other style, than that of *the sons of God;* in contradistinction to the sons of *Cain;* who, despising and rejecting the inheritance of the sons of God, were out of His adoption, and so *thereby the sons of men*, Genesis vi. 2.

SECTION VI.—*On the inferences made by good men from the translation of Enoch.*

Forgive me, if I cannot agree with you, that no certain or general conclusion could be made from *Enoch's* translation in behalf of good men. But I will trouble you the less on this head; because I cannot express my sense of it better than it is, Essay, section xii. page 455. And thither therefore I will take the liberty to refer you. I will only add, that I am confirmed in the opinion, that good men drew consequences in their own favour from that case, by finding them express their expectations after death, by saying that God would *receive* them: the word used *Genesis* v. 24, and *Enoch was not: for God took* (*received*) *him.* And of *Elijah,* (2 Kings ii. 9, 10,) Psalms xlix. 15. lxxiii. 24, where the same Hebrew word is used. And to this purpose, says the author of Ecclesiasticus, xliv. 16, that *Enoch pleased the Lord, and was translated, being* AN EXAMPLE OF REPENTANCE *to all generations.* But I think he could not have mentioned him as an example of repentance, if good men could not have deduced their future reward from his translation. I suppose they would imagine he was carried to *Eden.*

The Arabic version renders Heb. xi. 5, "translated into Paradise;" and The Zohar says, that, "by this translation, God assured all

the faithful of the resurrection and eternal life." And it is very remarkable that God took Enoch, the seventh from Adam, when he was but 365 years old, which was not half the life of Lamech, the shortest liver of all the antediluvian patriarchs that left this world after Adam, on whom the sentence of death had immediately passed, and had all the rest of the ten patriarchs, except Noah (that is to say, seven of them, witnesses of his translation). His translation therefore seems by these circumstances, as well as other considerations, to have been designed by God, as a fact of which all were to take the greatest notice, and from which it was designed they should form the most hopeful inferences. There seems also to have been a tradition among the Jews, that Enoch prophesied of the last judgment, Jude 14: if he did, he prophesied of the resurrection, by a necessary implication, and of a future state of rewards and punishments.

SECTION VII.—*On the hopes conceived by Noah from God's acceptance of his sacrifice, and on the sense in which the word "God" is to be understood in the book of Genesis.*

I do not doubt but *Noah* would conceive greater hopes of adoption than he had before, *from God's smelling a savour of rest in his sacrifice*, and for his sake promising, not only

that He would not drown the earth again, nor curse the ground any more, or any longer; but *blessing him and his sons*, and bidding *them be fruitful, and multiply, and have dominion.* I think he would, with the traditional hopes he already had from *Adam*, take this salvation from the deluge, this partial removing of the curse, and this restoration of part of the original blessing, as an earnest of the removal of the whole of the curse, and the restoring the whole of the original blessing; though he would no doubt think it must be after death, to which he saw all men subject.

This hope *Noah* expresses in *blessing God as the* God of Shem. To prove that God ever signifies a father, or a fatherly governor, where it occurs in *Genesis*, or till *Exodus* iii. 7, I must refer you to *Essay*, p. 393. 454. 499. 502. After Exod. iii. God often signifies king, or a kingly governor (and in the Old Testament, a king or kingly governor over the Israelitish nation), as well as father, or fatherly governor: and which of the two it then signifies can only be learnt by the context. The text you quote, Psalm cxlvii. 12—14, refers to God as a king; and therefore is well explained by protection and other blessings and felicity of his people. And *father*, when predicated of the Supreme Being in Scripture, includes in its notion the giver of an inheritance, to which his son had no right, but by

his gift. *Adam's* inheritance as a son of God by creation had been dominion, enjoyed in a body covered with a glory, in a blissful garden, and with the means of immortality; and such would he teach his posterity, that it was likely therefore for them to receive from God as their father by adoption. And that would therefore at least enter into their notion of God, unless there had been something added to limit and restrain it.

This notion of God was farther explained and confirmed to *Abraham* (*Shem's* descendant) in God's saying to him that, *in blessing, He would bless him* (see *Essay*, p. 502—512); that *in him all the families of the earth should be blessed;* that *He would be his exceeding great reward*, Genesis xv. 1; that *He counted his faith for righteousness* (see *Essay*, p. 454—502); and lastly, in styling *Himself his God*, Genesis xvii. 7, 8 (see *Essay*, p. 393—454); and giving him *Canaan for an everlasting possession:* which to a mortal man, that knew he must die, without any possession in it, Genesis xv. 15, must be by a resurrection.

SECTION VIII.—*The precise bearing of the argument between our Lord and the Sadducees stated.*

I do not take Christ's arguments against the *Sadducees* to turn either upon the expression, I

AM THE GOD *of Abraham;* or upon God's BEING CALLED *the God of Abraham;* since the three Evangelists use both these expressions, and likewise a third, in relating this argument. It cannot therefore depend on any of them. *Matthew* says, *Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ Θεὸς*; *Mark* says, *Ἐγὼ ὁ Θεὸς*; and *Luke*, *ὡς λέγει Κύριον τὸν Θεὸν Ἀβραάμ.* The force of the argument therefore must lie in the word *God;* signifying father or giver of an inheritance in immortality by a resurrection: as it must signify, since He is said to be the *God* of *Abraham* after he was dead, who received no possession of an inheritance from God whilst he lived. I think the force of the argument is rightly explained, *Essay*, p. 483—505; and if it be, it fully proves that our *Saviour* used the word *God* in the sense I have explained it. And it is as plain the Jewish nation understood God as the Giver of an inheritance, or the *Sadducees* would never have been silenced by this argument. What, I suppose, led them to deny the resurrection, was, that they saw God had given the children of Israel an inheritance in *Canaan* in this life. But still this, I suppose, would not have led them to deny the doctrine of the resurrection without their immoral lives, their opposition to the *Pharisees*, as a sect they extremely envied, (and as is natural in such cases) to every thing that was theirs: their oral law, their cabalistical interpretations, and their superstí-

tious observances; and even so far as to run quite into the contrary extreme. But all this together, indeed, led them to overlook THE EVERLASTING POSSESSION OF CANAAN promised to *Abraham*, though it was impossible for him, who had died without it, ever to receive it, but by a resurrection; and therefore, when our *Saviour* did but point this out to them, they were entirely silenced.

I think the *author* of the *Essay* has shewn, that the question between our Saviour and the *Sadducees* was about the resurrection, or reviviscence of a man, and not about the separate existence of the soul, vol. ii. 503—6.

SECTION IX.—*That the consciousness of the soul depends on its union with the body.*

But really, Sir, I am surprised that we talk of the separate existence of souls, as we do. That souls exist after the corruption and dissolution of the grosser parts of our bodies, is certain; for they are in the hand of God, and reserved in *Hades:* or, as it is expressed, Job xxxiv. 14, *they are gathered or return unto God:* (viz. *the spirit* or *breath of a man*). But to say, that they are conscious of misery or happiness, is not only without good ground from reason or Scripture, but in consequence destroys revelation.

We find ourselves *a compound being* of organized matter, and of something that thinks, and animates, and acts this organized matter. We find, when the organized matter is indisposed, that we do not think; as in deep sleeps, in faintings, in lethargies, and apoplectic fits; and that when we recover, we think again. Is it not reasonable to conclude, then, that, when the body is wholly and irrecoverably indisposed by death, the mind does not think? and that if ever it is to think again, it must think as it did here; that is, when it shall be reunited to its own body, and not in a separate state?

And *Moses* informs us, that *man was created in this manner*. For he acquaints us, that *God formed man* (or man's body) *out of the dust of the ground*, Gen. ii. 7; and so in the sentence, God says, that *he should eat his bread in the sweat of his brow, till he returned to the ground, out of which he was taken; for that he was dust, and to dust he should return*, Gen. iii. 19. All that distinguished him from the ground, besides the different modifications of his body, *was the breath of life, that God breathed into his nostrils. And so man became a living soul.* The body was first: and a breath breathed into that body, to animate it afterwards. It was no separate pre-existent soul, and is not like to be in a state of separate action after the body goes to the dust; but, as it was designed at first to animate that body,

is most like to be totally inactive, till it animates its own body again. I should think the doctrine of a pre-existent, and of a separate state of souls (I mean of a separate state of rewards and punishments) to be much more consistent than the doctrine of a coeval formation of body and soul, and a separate state of souls. If I therefore was for a separate state of rewards and punishments, I should be for the pre-existence of souls.

SECTION X.—*The opinion that the soul is conscious in a separate state is inconsistent with the notion of a long life, or death.*

Thus far I have examined the notion of a separate state of rewards and punishments, with our own experience, and with *Moses'* history of the creation of man. Let us, if you please, examine it a little by the notion of *long life*, or *death*. The first is ever represented in Scripture as a blessing. But how that will be consistent with the notion of a separate state, I do not see. I can less see how it will consist with the Scripture notion of death. How will that, which was the first threatening, stand on the supposition of this separate state? Can it on this supposition be a threatening? or, when executed, a punishment? What is death? Nothing but the soul's being separated from the body, to act in a sepa-

rate state? Where is the sting of death, then? What is it—only the few hours' or moments' pangs of death? Sometimes, when men die, they are not felt, and men literally fall asleep. Where is the punishment then in that case? Or suppose it costs us pangs to get rid of this prison, and to escape, and be for ever free, are we not put in a better condition by death? and is it not worth the struggle to be eternally loosed from this confinement? Unless therefore we add eternal death, from our systems, to God's threatening, I cannot see that death could be any threatening at all. But if dying be ceasing for ever to be conscious and to enjoy; then indeed the threatening is tremendous. So *St. Paul* understands it: for he says, as *by man came death, so by man came the resurrection from the dead.* And as in *Adam all died, so in Christ shall all be made alive.* And therefore all would have lain under the power of death, according to his assertion, had it not been for Christ.

SECTION XI.—*The reasoning in the foregoing section confirmed by considerations drawn from the translation of Enoch and Elijah, and the restoration to life of the widow's son, Lazarus, &c.*

Farther, what is *translation,* if the soul acts in a separate state? Could it be any privilege to *Enoch* or *Elijah* to carry a body out of this

world, if the soul can act without it? But if the man that dies must not only taste death, but see corruption (which is always represented as somewhat different from death, the grave, and *Hades*), under which the man does not act, and must lie under the power of it a great while, then indeed it is evident, that translation must be a great privilege; since, without losing consciousness and enjoyment for a moment, *Enoch* and *Elijah* were immediately translated from living and enjoying in this world, to live and enjoy in a better.

Upon the supposition of a separate happy state of souls, how hard, Sir, will be the case of those that *were raised* from the dead so as to *die again?* as the son of the woman of *Sarepta*, and of the *Shunamite;* the dead man that revived at touching the bones of the dead prophet; the widow of *Nain's* son (whom Christ raised, out of the greatest compassion); *Lazarus*, Christ's friend; the saints that rose and went into the holy city after Christ's resurrection; and *Dorcas:* for it was then no less than being fetched from a happy state of reward, to such a wretched state as this must be, in comparison of it. And to be raised so greatly to their disadvantage, and (as in several of these cases) out of the greatest compassion, good-will, and the tenderest friendship, is altogether incredible. It is much we hear nothing of the expostulations

and complaints of the raised; nor any account from them of what passed in the separate state. Can we suppose our *Saviour*, at least, to gratify the affection of a widow for her son, so much at his expense? But it does not want your sagacity, to see how this difficulty ceases, if, as in my way of thinking, they were all raised from sleep: for they then had so much more consciousness and enjoyment added to their existence, as they had days and years in this life again. And every one must see, in that case, that it was a privilege to the parties themselves, as well as to their relations and friends.

SECTION XII.—*The consciousness of the separate state inconsistent with the idea of a future judgment, and with the idea of "sleep," under which that state is represented in the New Testament.*

Besides, we are to be tried at the last judgment. I see no previous *particular* judgment in Scripture. That seems to have been contrived to eke out the doctrine of a separate state of rewards and punishments. And are we then, Sir, to be tried for any thing, but what we have done in the flesh? One would not only wish, but hope, from Scripture, that our trial would not outlast this life. But are we to be tried for every thing that was done in the flesh, for the short term of about fourscore years, and to have no

trial at all of all that passes in the separate state for so many hundred ages? And yet it is sufficiently evident from Scripture, that the separate state can be no state of trial neither. But inconsistencies crowd in too thick upon me here, to allow me to trouble you farther on this head.

Nor is this notion of a separate state barely inconsistent with the Scripture notion of long life (translation, the resurrection of some to this life again), and with the general notion of the judgment, as considered separately in Scripture; but also with these, when they are considered together, and joined also with the resurrection: for the representation of the Old and New Testament is, that a man (the compound being) is *born*, *lives*, *dies* (or *sleeps*), and rises (or awakes): some first, whilst *the rest of the dead do not live;* and those others afterwards; and are sentenced to eternal life, or to the second death. It is unnecessary to quote texts to such a master of the Bible as you are. Besides, how comes death to be called sleep, if the soul wakes? or we to be described in a state of forgetfulness and inaction? whereas, if the soul is conscious in a separate state, it can never forget: and the only agent in man never ceases to act, imagine, and devise for one single moment.

SECTION XIII.—*The preceding argument confirmed by several passages in St. Paul's Epistles, and in the Revelation.*

If, from comparing the doctrine of a separate state of rewards with the representation of things both in the Old and New Testament, we compare it with some particular texts in the New, we shall find *St. Paul* arguing, 1 Cor. xv. 18, that if there is no resurrection, *then they that are fallen asleep* (*even*) *in* (or for) Christ are perished. Though it is not to be supposed, that those *Corinthians*, who doubted of a resurrection, doubted also of a future state. He also speaks, v. 19, of the disbelief of a resurrection, as having hope in Christ only in this life. The *Spirit* pronounces the dead in the *Lord blessed;* because *they rest from their labours,* Rev. xiv. 13. Would this part of their blessedness have been mentioned, if they were immediately to have had their reward? And so also the only reason *Paul* gives the *Thessalonians* why they should not mourn for their friends, that were fallen asleep in Christ, as the heathen did, who had no hope, is, that God *would bring* their dead friends *again with Him,* 1 Thess. iv. 13—18. Yet the heathens talked of a separate state. But this was so airy a notion, in *St. Paul's* opinion, that he speaks of those who had it as being without any hope at all. And *without*

hope, is with him one of the characters of the heathen state, as much *as being without God in the world*, Eph. ii. 12. Indeed *St. Paul* would be thought a miserable comforter now-a-days. We can go land's length beyond him, and give mourners the strongest consolation, by telling them; "That the souls of believers at death do immediately pass into glory;" that we should not be so selfish therefore as to wish them here again for our sakes; since we must "be so cruel to them, if we do, as to wish them back again from Christ and out of Paradise. Whereas we ought, like true friends, to be thoroughly joyful; since our loss is their gain," and they, by leaving us, become immediately happy.

If that was the case of the *thief* on the cross, as well as of our blessed *Saviour* Himself; and if perhaps *St. Paul* knew it to be his case too; What then? I should only still consider these as excepted cases, like *Enoch's* (perhaps *Moses'*) and *Elijah's* under the Old Testament; and from which no consequence to this purpose can be drawn.

But if that were the general case, and the *martyrs* and *confessors* are to have the *blessedness* of the first resurrection, and are to live on earth (as by the xxth of the Revelations one would think they are), shall I not quite tire you with questions on this head, if I ask, what that blessedness can consist in, but the taking their

souls from the third heaven, where they see the glory of God, and are with Christ and the blessed angels; to be reunited to their body, and dwell here with men again? This sure they would scarce think a *blessedness*.

SECTION XIV.—*The consciousness of the separate state inconsistent with the scriptural description of the happiness of the reunion of the soul and body, with the account of the second death, and with the duties of Christianity.*

But why do I ask this question about the first resurrection, which some suppose will be the blessedness, comparatively, but of a few? For if we suppose a separate state, what will the doctrine of the *general resurrection of the just*, which was all the hope of good men under the Old Testament, and more clearly of good men under the New, the great discovery of Christ to the Gentiles, come to, but a doctrine useless in itself, and destructive of all the rest of revelation? For if we can be conscious and happy without our own bodies, what use can a body be of to us when we revive? It can add nothing to a spirit capable of acting without it. Nay, what is more, it must certainly be a clog to it; let it be as refined, as active, as powerful, as glorious, and as heavenly, as it may. To be pure spirit would be the greatest perfection, if it

could be attained. But perhaps that is the sole prerogative of God Himself. I take this to contain the force of the strongest objection that the heathen philosophers ever made against Christianity; namely, that what it proposed as the hope of Christians, was their dread; and a punishment instead of their reward; for that when once they got rid of the clog of their bodies, they never desired to be imprisoned in them again. I do not see how it is possible to answer it, on the supposition of a separate state of reward.

But the notion of a separate happy state of souls strikes at revealed religion yet deeper. It does not only confound the doctrine of the resurrection, but leaves little room for any revelation: that is to say, for any farther discovery from God, than what we can attain by the help of our reason. That discovers to us our duty, and a future state of rewards and punishments. But indeed it could not certainly tell us what that future state should be. On the other hand, the future state was left in great uncertainty and under great difficulties, whilst it was only supposed to be enjoyed by unembodied ghosts and shades. This might do well in poetical fictions and romances; but was too airy to have satisfied a thorough philosopher. Besides, we could not be certain how long the future state would last; or that it would not be a state of trial. Nor

could we see, how we should have bodies again prepared for us, if we could have seen that they were necessary to our future happiness. But if a separate state be so improbable, and that it is most probable that we can only act as compound beings, how seasonably does the doctrine of a resurrection come to our aid? since, as we cannot enjoy without a body, we, by the revelation of this doctrine, know, that we shall have a body again; and that, instead of this vile, weak, animal, earthy, mortal body, after the first *Adam* (who was an earthy man, and but an earthy lord), we shall have a spiritual, glorious, active, powerful, immortal body, like to the glorious body of the second *Adam*, a quickening spirit, and a heavenly Lord: that we shall not be subject to a state of farther trial; that the second death shall have no power over us; and that we shall ever be with the Lord, and see Him as He is. This is the doctrine of the resurrection of the just, that is contained in the New Testament. Our immortality, as described there, rests on the incorruptibility of our raised bodies. The immortality of the soul is a notion not to be met with in Scripture; and this gives our future reward all the clearness, certainty, and value, we could wish; and therefore is that, which is highly worthy of God to reveal to us; and is therefore also that, which, it is reasonable to think, He would reveal.

Allow me to trouble you with one observation more, before I conclude this head of argument. The first death, according to Scripture, is a man's going to the grave, and to Hades, and seeing corruption, till the body comes out of the grave, and the soul from *Hades*, and is reunited to an immortal body; at which time the dead man enters into the possession of eternal life. The second death, according to Scripture, is the casting the dead, that are raised to condemnation, into *the lake which burneth* with fire and brimstone, Rev. xxi. 8 (and where the *devil shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever*, ch. xx. 10). This account of the second death is in some measure analogous to the Scripture account of the first death. The first being a falling into a natural sleep, in order to revive again; whilst the second is a violent death, an everlasting destruction, from which there is no recovery. But does the account of the second death look at all like a description of a separate state of punishment? And yet I believe you will readily agree with me, that it is not at all likely there should be any separate state of reward, if there be no separate state of punishment.

If the notion of immediate happiness after death in a separate state comports ill with several of the other doctrines of Scripture, I will beg you once more to consider, whether it will com-

port better with some of the *duties* of it. Perhaps it may be said, that we shall be kept from doing direct violence to ourselves, from the fear of losing the rewards both of the separate and of the raised state. But will not this notion insensibly tempt us to be *less careful* of preserving life; and *less patient* under the pains and inquietudes of it? I am sure I have seen unhappy effects this way of some good men's persuasion of their immediate happiness after death. Impatience for death is a vice in a good man; though it may be considered as the excrescence of a virtue. But if patience of life could be supposed to be consistent with the notion of immediate happiness after death, I should yet think it is hardly consistent with the *composure* in dying, which seems to me to be most proper and becoming for those that are just falling asleep. The hope of immediate happiness will beget rapture. But rapture and composure cannot well consist together.

I think I may now venture to say, that the notion I have been contending for, viz. that as we act now, as compound beings, so it is the law of the great Author of our beings, that whenever, and as long as we act, we should act as compound beings, is all along supposed in revelation. Without this supposition, we shall neither see clearly the end of a revelation from God, nor of the revelation in particular,

which He has given. Believers' not having this in their eye has brought in more confusion into divinity, than any thing else that perplexes that sublime part of knowledge. And, by the way, he that reads the *Essay*, &c. must suppose the author to have had this thought ever present to his mind, or I think he will not thoroughly understand him.

SECTION XV.—*Abraham expected to be raised to an everlasting possession of the land of Canaan.*

But to return to *Abraham* (after this long though necessary digression); I do not suppose that by *God's blessing him*, becoming *his exceeding great reward, reckoning his faith for righteousness*, or being *his God*, he understood, that after death he should rise in a body of glory, and of the great activity and power that the New Testament ascribes to the raised body, and in which we are to enjoy heaven. No; here I think the author mistaken. Any body may see he treads tenderly in this place, like one that did not feel his ground firm under him. Though I suppose he saw no better ground to stand on, no more than others who went before him. But I take it for granted, that, with the traditional hopes *Abraham* had from *Adam*, he now also expected to be raised up to have the land of

CANAAN FOR *an everlasting possession*, from the farther revelations God saw fit to give him.

It is most likely, that the place of *Eden*, in so long a tract of time, and by the alterations the flood had made, was unknown and lost. Besides, if it had been known, it was but a garden; incapable of holding a family like *Abraham's*, that was to become *a great nation*, Gen. xii. 2, like in number to *the sand of the sea, or the stars of heaven.* It was therefore fit to point out to him a country, that should be given to him, and his seed, at their resurrection, for *an everlasting possession.* What land should that be, but the land *God had directed him to*, and had now shewn him? *Gen.* xii. 1; *a land, even as the* GARDEN *of* the Lord, *Gen.* xiii. 10; a land, which God is afterwards said, *to have espied* for his children, the delight of all lands; a land flowing with milk and honey.

Now this land, God says, He gives *to Abraham for* AN EVERLASTING POSSESSION, xvii. 8 (He had before promised it to him and his seed for ever, chap. xiii. 15), which I apprehend, was no more than giving him and his seed an inheritance in *Canaan* in fee simple, as our *lawyers* would now express it. But it was but an inheritance in fee simple in reversion, and a reversion in fee simple in an inheritance in *Abraham*, though *Abraham* himself was never to be in possession of it. *Abraham* understands it so, chap.

xv. 2; for he says, *What wilt thou give me, seeing I go childless, and the steward of my house* (who must in all propriety be my heir, as a son of my house, or born in my house, if I have no child) *is this Eliezer of Damascus?* so *Abram* also fully explains it, v. 3; and in that sense the *word of the Lord*, that came to him, makes a reply, v. 4, saying, *This* (Eliezer) shall not *be thine heir, but he that shall come out of thy own bowels;* and then tells him, that his seed, viz. by that one, that was to come out of his own bowels, should be in number as the stars: v. 5, after telling him, that he shall have numerous descendants, God adds, v. 7, *I have brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give thee this land to inherit it:* i. e. to have thyself an inheritance in reversion in it, and for thy seed to inherit it from or through thee. *Abram* then asks, v. 8, whereby he should know that he *should inherit it?* in which the word *inherit* has still the same sense, viz. of a reversionary inheritance: as also farther appears by God's answer; which in sum is this: "That by that time the iniquity of the *Amorites* should be full, which would not be till the fourth generation, his seed should come into *Canaan* again, and have the land from the river of Egypt unto Euphrates: that, in the mean time, he should go to his fathers in peace, and be buried in a good old age (all which demonstratively shews, that his inheritance was

to be no more than a right of inheritance in reversion), and that his seed should be strangers in a land that was not theirs, be slaves, and be slaves groaning under hard oppression; but that God would punish that nation at length, and that his seed should go out of that land with great substance." *In that same day* (in the evening) God *makes a covenant with* (or promise to) *Abraham*, saying, *unto thy seed have I given this land:* which He then describes very particularly by two great boundaries, and by the several nations that then inhabited it. And this very covenant or promise, *Nehemiah* long afterwards observes, *that God had performed, because he was righteous*, Nehem. ix. 8: that *Nehemiah* refers to this covenant appears by his naming six of the nations that are mentioned here; and under which, those, that he does not mention, are comprehended. And this I find is generally the description of the land when the first promise is referred to. See Exod. iii. 8. 17. xiii. 5. 23. xxxii. 2. xxxiv. 11. Josh. ix. 1. xxiv. 11.

But after all this, when *Abraham* was ninety-nine years old, just before he was ordered to circumcise himself, and the males of his house, and just before he obeyed that order, GOD APPEARED to him, Gen. xvii. 1: whereas in the 15th chapter, where God had given him and his seed but a reversionary inheritance in *Canaan* after 470 years, it was only THE WORD OF THE

LORD THAT CAME to him (by some voice, or in a dream, or vision). At this time God tells him, that He appears to him, to make a covenant with him, v. 2, or *an everlasting covenant*, as it is called, v. 7. The introduction is very solemn and majestic: *I am the Almighty God*, v. 1. The condition of the covenant is, *walk before me, and be thou perfect* (or upright). "Walk as in my sight, as *Adam* did, till sin made him fly from me, and endeavour to hide himself; and as *Enoch* did afterwards, whom I received; and *Noah* after that, whom I saved." This condition at least implies the most sincere and exemplary piety. And when the promise comes to be fully explained and particularized, it is; *And I will give unto* THEE *and to thy* SEED *after* THEE *the land of thy pilgrimage, all the land of* CANAAN FOR AN EVERLASTING POSSESSION. God had made several promises, that is, absolute promises, to *Abraham* before; at least without any condition expressed: one of which is called a covenant, Gen. xv. 18; as a promise sometimes is in other texts of Scripture. But here the condition was fully expressed, and the promise was made, to speak as the terms of our law, on a consideration; which is always thought to give strength to any claim that may afterwards be made in virtue of the promise. The promise is, to give unto *him, and to his seed after him, all the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession.*

This must be something different from all that God had promised *Abraham* before. God can never be supposed to appear to *Abram;* make this solemn preface to what He is going to say; tell him, that He is come to make an everlasting covenant with him; which is in general to be a God unto him, and to his seed after him (which He had never promised him before); insist on a condition; at last enjoin him a painful rite as the sign and seal of this covenant; and all this at last in reality end in nothing but what He had promised in the former chapters.

SECTION XVI.—*Each successive promise to Abraham added something in substance and clearness to the preceding.*

I hope to make it evident that there is no bare repetition in any one of God's revelations to *Abraham* (in the xiith, xiiith, xvth, or xviith chapters of Genesis), of any thing that God had said in a former. The revelations in these chapters ever contain something new, and something more than had been plainly revealed before. God's revelations to *Abram* are, as all his others, like the shining light, that groweth more and more unto the perfect day. Why should not we then suppose that to be the case in this appearance in the xviith chapter? especially when it is considered in all its circum-

stances? Indeed we cannot suppose it to be otherwise, if, besides what I have just now mentioned, we consider the words of this promise, and compare them with all the other words mentioned Gen. xii. 7. xiii. 15. 17, and xv. 7. 16. 18: for *possession* is a very different thing from an *inheritance* in fee simple *in reversion;* which was all (as I flatter myself you will agree with me) that God had particularly and plainly promised before. And an *everlasting possession* is very different from *an inheritance to him and his seed for ever:* since a man may have an inheritance in him, to himself, and his seed for ever; and yet he himself never have any, much less an everlasting possession in it. And this is plainly pointed out here by God's promising *Abram* this everlasting possession in the land, that was *the land* OF HIS PILGRIMAGE; or the land, wherein *he was a stranger.* And so the author of the epistle to the *Hebrews* understands it, Heb. xi. 8, by telling us, *that he sojourned in a land that he should* AFTERWARDS RECEIVE FOR AN INHERITANCE; which word inheritance stands there for an inheritance in possession. Besides, that this was a different promise from any promise that God had made him before, appears, not only from its being a conditional one to *Abram,* but to all his seed; which the other was not. This also shews, that THE SEED, to whom this promise is made,

means a different thing, from the seed mentioned when He promises the inheritance of *Canaan to his seed*, or to him, or to both, *for ever* (Gen. xii. 7. xiii. 15. 17. xv. 7. 16. 18); and therefore must mean his spiritual or faithful seed, or his imitators, who are called seed, or children in Scripture, as well as descendants; and particularly Gen. iii. 15. iv. 2: and that this promise was made to his imitators, appears from hence: that the promise, being on the condition *of walking before God, and being perfect*, could not ensure to such of his descendants as did not perform that condition.

SECTION—XVII. *In what sense God promises Abraham "to multiply him exceedingly."*

This is farther evident by God's promising him, *that He would multiply him exceedingly*, v. 2; which God explains to be so exceeding, that whereas He had before told him He would make him become a great nation (ch. xii. 2); now he tells him He will make him a father of a MULTITUDE OF NATIONS; which in the natural way *Abram* was not, at the writing this history, nor since, as far as we know, as I shall have another occasion to observe to you presently: the meaning therefore is, that he, like a father, shall transmit the everlasting possession of *Canaan* to a multitude of nations; or to all the families or nations of the earth who should imitate him in faith

and obedience. Or, if you please, that a multitude of nations should receive the everlasting possession of *Canaan* through him (as their father; or) as his children, if they imitated him in *walking before God and being upright;* but not have the honour to receive it immediately from God, as he had received it. So also *St. Paul* interprets it, when he says, that *God, foreseeing that He would justify the Gentiles, through faith, preached the gospel before unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all the nations of the earth be blessed,* Gal. iii. 8. God adds, that therefore his name should not be called *Abram,* but *Abraham:* and says farther, v. 6, *and I will make thee exceeding fruitful; and I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee.* The sense of which is, "not that I would not have you think, that by this new and everlasting covenant, with you as the pattern, and with all that imitate your piety (and who are your seed in the best sense), I mean to cancel the promise I have already made to you about your natural descendants: no; I will add even to that promise; instead of cancelling or diminishing it. For whereas I have only hitherto promised you to make of you *a great nation;* now I promise you *to make* NATIONS OF YOU (which was accomplished in the Ishmaelites, Edomites and Israelites descending from him), and that kings shall come out of you." This I think is the sense of v. 6. But

as he adds, v. 7, 8, "My main intention now is to establish a covenant, or make it firm with thee, and to that spiritual or faithful seed of thine which I began to speak of, v. 2. 4, 5; on the condition I have just now mentioned.

"And my covenant in general is, that I WILL BE A GOD (or father or giver of an inheritance that may be worthy of that relation) *to thee and to thy seed after thee.* And hereby thou mayest further understand what I meant, when I first appeared to *thee*, and said, Gen. xii. 3, that in *thee all the families of the earth should be blessed:* for now thou seest, that in the covenant I make with thee, the promised blessing is to be derived from thee, by those that shall imitate thy piety, in all generations, v. 7. But that I may be yet more particular, and that thou mayest fully understand what that blessing was, ch. xii. 3, and the full import of the promise which I have now made thee, *of being a God to thee and to thy* (spiritual or faithful) *seed after thee*, I will give unto thee, and *to thy* spiritual or faithful *seed after thee, the land of thy pilgrimage*, or wherein *thou art* at present *a stranger*, without any possession; even all this land for an EVERLASTING POSSESSION. And thus will I BE THEIR GOD as well as yours." Natural fathers cannot secure a son more than a right in reversion; sons being mortal, and liable to death before their fathers: but it would be altogether unbecoming the

bounty and munificence of our heavenly Father, even when He becomes such by adoption only, not to secure every adopted son of His an everlasting possession. So the author of the epistle to the *Hebrews* argues, Heb. xi. 16. God farther adds, that He will be a God not only to him and to his spiritual or faithful seed to the third or fourth, but IN (ALL) THEIR GENERATIONS. Thus, on the whole, as the *author* of the epistle to the *Hebrews* tells us, Heb. xi. 39, after he (Abraham) had patiently endured (viz. all the danger of his journey from *Charan*, and his sojourning in *Canaan* from the 75th year of his age to the 99th) he obtained the promise, viz. this promise or grant; which I apprehend is called the promise κατ' ἐξοχὴν here, and in other places: Gal. iii. 14. 17, 18. 22. 29.

SECTION XVIII.—*The promise to Abraham plainly implies his resurrection.*

After all that God had said to Abraham, Gen. xii. 2. 37. xiii. 14. 18. xv. 1—21, of giving him an inheritance in the land of *Canaan*, and to his seed after him; yet God had expressly told him, that he should die, and never have that inheritance in possession, Gen. xv. 15; and that his seed (descendants) should not have it till the 4th generation: and yet God here tells him, that He will give unto him *Canaan* for *an ever-*

lasting possession; and establish this to him and his seed after him in (all) *their generations.* What could be the meaning of this? or what could *Abraham* understand less by it, than that God would give him this everlasting possession after death? and consequently, that He would give it him by *raising him from the dead?* That indeed God had in effect promised him before, *when He blessed him,* ch. xii. 3; and when He *counted his faith for righteousness,* Gen. xv. 6. *See the Essay,* vol. ii. 483. 489. 508. But He here adds, that upon his being restored to life, CANAAN should BE HIS EVERLASTING POSSESSION; and thus, what he should possess after the resurrection was fully ascertained. From thence *Abraham* might infer farther, that God would raise him up in an animal body; since possessing of a country (and a city) must not only be the possession of a compound being; but of a being compounded of a soul and an animal body: so it seems at present to me: though it is probable, however, he would expect such a body as *Adam* had had in Paradise. And from his being to be raised in an animal body it is, that our Saviour speaks of *many that shall sit down with Him,* &c. *and eat and drink with Christ, in the kingdom of heaven,* Matth. viii. 11. Luke xxii. 30. See also Mark xiv. 25. And hence *Paul* calls *the promise of the Spirit, the blessing of* ABRAHAM, Gal. iii. 14; because *Abra-*

ham and all his faithful seed are to be raised to the everlasting possession of *Canaan* by the Spirit. And so in like manner must *Abraham* have understood God, when God says, He would give *Canaan* for an everlasting possession to his seed IN (all, or in every one *of*) THEIR GENERATIONS, when yet He had said, ch. xv. 16, that his seed should not possess their inheritance in *Canaan till the 4th generation.*

SECTION XIX.—*The terms of the promise clearly confine the everlasting possession of Canaan to Abraham and his spiritual seed only.*

Besides, *Abraham* would naturally conclude, that as his seed were to have the everlasting possession of *Canaan* on the same condition as he had, so that they were to have it in the same way. This therefore must have explained it fully to him, that by his *seed,* God meant here his spiritual or faithful seed, either of his own family, or of any other family; for he could never think that all his natural descendants would imitate him, in walking before God and being perfect: or that, though God would not fulfil this promise to him, but on performing this condition; yet that He would fulfil it to his seed, though they did not perform the condition; and raise them up from the dead to this *everlasting possession,* only because they were his natural descendants. Such foolish and

unjust thoughts of God, and such vain thoughts of himself, could never enter into the head of any man, much less of one of the wisest and the best. However, God farther explains this matter, and shews him, that the promise was not to endure to all his descendants; for that *this everlasting covenant* should not be to his son *Ishmael by Hagar*, but should be with *Isaac* by Sarah; and should be derived through *Isaac* to the imitators of himself (*Abraham*) in all ages; and therefore an imitator of *Isaac's* piety should be entitled to the everlasting possession of *Canaan;* but an imitator of *Ishmael* should not. And thus *St. Paul* understood it; as we plainly see, Rom. iv. 13—18, and Gal. iii. 28, 29; and so also Rom. ix. 7, 8; for he says, that they which are of the flesh (or the carnal seed of Abraham) *are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed.* In any view but this, there seems little less promised to *Ishmael* than to *Isaac:* the temporal felicity promised to both of them is much upon a level.

Thus *Abraham* would understand this covenant by comparing it with what God had said to him, ch. xii. 7. xiii. 15.—18, and ch. xv. But he would more fully understand it, if he more particularly compared it, and all that had been said to him from ch. xii. 7. to xvii. 8, with ch. xii. 1—4, in another view. In the first appearance to *Abraham*, God seems to say, *Get*

thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee. "And that thou mayest do it the more cheerfully, I now tell thee in general, that I will make of thee a great nation, and bless (or prosper) thee; even so as to make thy name great; and so as to make thee a blessing to others; and so as to be a friend to thy allies, and an enemy to thy enemies (this is a blessing I will give to thee and thy family). And moreover, I will so bless thee, as that in blessing thee, I will also bless, or convey a blessing to, all the families of the earth: this I now tell thee in general: and both of these blessings (i. e. the blessing to thy family in particular, and to all the families of the earth in general) I will explain more fully to thee when thou shalt be in that land."

Accordingly, as soon as he comes into *Canaan* (*the Canaanites being then in the land*) God, to encourage him, begins with telling him, v. 7, *unto thy seed will I give this land.* Upon his separating from *Lot* in the peaceable manner he did, ch. xiii. God tells him, v. 15: "That all the land he saw (that is, of which he had now a fuller prospect, perhaps from some great eminence) God would give it to him, and to his seed for ever: that is (as I hope I have already made it appear to you) to him, as the original grantee in reversion, and to his seed, as

his seed; or by the title they should derive from being his descendants." After the war with the Kings, "*the word of the Lord came to him* (ch. xv.) not to fear, for that God would protect and reward him: and upon *Abram's* desiring to know how he could transmit a title to this land to his seed, when he had none; and therefore, as that was his case, whether God meant by his seed, any thing more, than the seed of one that he should adopt for his piety; viz. his *steward, Eliezer of Damascus?* God tells him, no; but that it should be a seed by a son that came from himself, v. 4; and that it was by him that God would make *Abram* a great nation; for that his seed by that son of his should be in number like the stars. God then tells him, that he shall only be the original grantee in reversion, without ever coming into possession of the land, in the state it then was (so I understand it); and that though his seed by his son should possess the land, as it then was, it should not be till the 4th generation, v. 15, 16. God then tells him the boundaries of the land, by naming two great rivers; and by an account of the inhabitants who then possessed it;" and by this the bounds of the country that was granted were very much enlarged beyond what they were, Gen. xiii. 15.

Thus far God had gradually opened to *Abram* most of the particulars of the blessing He had

promised to him, as the father of his own particular family, and to his family in a literal sense, Gen. xii. 2; and the former part of the 3d verse: never barely repeating what He had promised before, but still adding something new. But in the 1st, 2d, 3d, 4th, 5th, 7th, and 8th verses of chapter xvii. God opens to him the promise of the blessing, which He had promised him, as the Father of all the families of the earth, and all those families (a blessing that He had mentioned more generally, ch. xii., and the latter part of the 3d verse), and likewise with some addition to the promise to him, and his own family, v. 6; and after this, God refers to both these promises, ch. xviii. 17, and says to this effect: "Shall I hide from *Abraham* the thing I am about to do to *Sodom*, when I have revealed so much more to him? seeing that I have told *Abraham* that he shall become a *mighty nation*" (there is the promise to him and to his family); and that all *the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him* (there is the promise to him and all the families of the earth). And as God has now revealed to him all the particulars in both these promises, that He ever intended to reveal to him, He does not discover any thing more to him afterwards; but only on the highest act of his piety, viz. his being ready to offer up *Isaac*, God *confirms* both the promises and every particular of them, by an oath, ch. xxii. 17, 18;

viz. "That *in blessing I will bless thee* (this is in general), and (the blessing shall be that) *in multiplying I will multiply thy seed, as the stars of heaven, and as the sand of the sea-shore, and thy seed shall possess the gates of his enemies* (there is the promise to him and his family or carnal seed); *and* (also that) *in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed;* or (which comes entirely to the same thing) *bless themselves;* i. e. esteem themselves blessed (there is the promise to him and to all the families of the earth; i. e. his spiritual or faithful seed): and the like distinction between these two promises may be traced in the appearance of God to *Isaac*, Gen. xxvi. 3. 5, and in the first appearance to *Jacob* at *Luz*, Gen. xxviii. 13, 14, and is observed by the son of *Sirach*, Ecclus. xliv. 21. And as the oath of God went to both promises, it is quoted in Scripture, sometimes to strengthen the hope of good men in one promise, and sometimes in the other. And these I apprehend are THE COVENANTS mentioned by *St. Paul*, Rom. ix. 4, following the *adoption* (viz. of *Abraham*, Gen. xvii. 7) *and the glory* (that appeared to him much oftener than to any of his ancestors), and preceding *the giving of the law*, the service, and all the other *promises* made to *David* by Nathan, and by other prophets, to the good men that succeeded. I should think this the precise sense of the cove-

nants in the place last quoted. But our accurate *commentator*, *Mr. Locke*, has strangely jumbled some of these Jewish privileges; and, as I apprehend, for want of observing these two covenants. *See Locke in loc.*

SECTION. XX.—*The conduct of Abraham after receiving the promises clearly shewed that he expected an everlasting possession.*

It follows from all I have said, that *Abraham* must have understood the promise, in the 1st, 2d, 3d, 4th, 5th, 7th, and 8th verses of the xviith chapter to be the *acme* of all God's promises to him. He would therefore after that naturally look to the first promise (namely, that to him, as the great ancestor of his particular family, and his descendants by *Sarah*) as leading to the last (namely, the promise to him as the father of all the families of the earth, and those families), and as a pledge of it. And no one can imagine that after this, either he, or *Isaac*, or *Jacob*, or any of their pious descendants, would ever turn their thoughts towards *Canaan* without thinking of the everlasting possession of it; and that it was the memory of this that they all meant to signify and perpetuate, by being buried, according to their most express order, in the burying place which *Abraham had purchased for a possession of a burying place* in Hebron.

And indeed without this principle, one does not see what should animate *Abraham* (any more than *Isaac* or *Jacob*) not only to leave his inheritance in his own land (which the first general promise, Gen. xii. 1. 4, might have done, as I have explained it), but (instead of returning thither) to continue to sojourn in the land of *Canaan*, according to God's command, Gen. xii. 1. xvii. 8. xxvi. 3, and dwelling there only in tents. Could the expectation that his descendants in the 4th generation (i. e. 470 years after) should possess that land, be that principle? I think it is infinitely too feeble, and what we never have seen in human nature. And I therefore also think, that for that reason, as well as others, it could never have been a principle recommended to our imitation in Scripture: especially such a principle, as that for it *Abraham* would have deserved the title of the *father of the faithful* in all ages. The author of the epistle to the *Hebrews* says to this purpose, ch. xi. 13: *These* (viz. *Abraham, Isaac and Jacob*) *died in faith, not having received the* PROMISES (not either the 1st or the 2d): *but having seen* them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them. Nor does he seem to mention *promises* there in the plural number, by chance, or by a figure; since he puts it in the singular number, v. 39, where it must stand so; since some of them that had been mentioned before,

v. 3, had received one of the promises; as *Nehemiah* observes, Neh. ix. 8; because, as he adds, *God was* RIGHTEOUS. This shews that the author of this epistle had the two promises, which I have mentioned, present to his mind, v. 13; and there are several other passages in *St. Paul's* other epistles that shew the same thing.

Farther; what was the language of Abraham's staying in *Canaan*, where he had no possession? and of his dwelling in tents there, like a traveller or pilgrim? (Travellers and pilgrims in that age of the world having had no better reception than the tents they pitched could afford them.) Would a man have stayed from his own possessions, that expected no other himself? That could not be. Yet it is as plain by his conduct, that he did not expect any in *Ur of the Chaldees;* for then he would have returned thither, having had frequent opportunities to do so. And what was the meaning of his not trying to get a possession in *Canaan*, and of his not building a city there, a great prince as he was, and with all his *wealth* and substance, but that he looked for a better? And, though he declared himself a traveller and pilgrim, by living in tents; yet why did he still travel only in that country, and not through it, to some other country; but only that he expected his possession there? though, indeed, after death: when the

author of the epistle to the *Hebrews* tells them, that *Abraham* expected to find it so much a better country, as to deserve the name of an *heavenly one*, ch. xi. 16; and to find a city in it, *whose builder and maker is* God, v. 10; which perhaps is the HEAVENLY *Jerusalem*, ch. xii. 22; not a *Jerusalem* in heaven, any more than a *Canaan* in heaven; but *from heaven;* where *St. John* saw the *new Jerusalem coming down prepared* (by God the builder of it) *as a bride adorned for her husband*, Rev. xxi. 2.

And what the foundations of this city are, may be seen, Rev. xxi. 19—22. The expectation of all this therefore is the language of *Abraham's* conduct, and is argued to be so by the *author* of the epistle to the *Hebrews*, ch. xi. 9, 10. 13—16. But he says of *Abraham, Isaac* and *Jacob*, and of all the worthy men among their descendants, as low as the apocryphal times, and even down to that time (v. 39, 40), *that none of them had received the* PROMISE, *God having provided some better thing for us* Christians; (viz. heaven, to be enjoyed in heavenly bodies, far better than paradisaical *Canaan* in paradisaical bodies;) that they *without us might not be made perfect.*

But though *Abraham* sojourned only in *Canaan*, according to God's command, and, suitably to his state of pilgrimage there, dwelt only in a tent; yet he purchased *a field for a* POSSESSION

of a burying place: shewing thereby his faith of his seed's inheriting the land; and more especially of his faithful seed's obtaining this everlasting possession in it. This purchase may be considered in *Abraham*, who was a *prophet*, as a prophetical sign, both of the temporal inheritance and the everlasting possession; and therefore *Moses* takes so much care in his history to inform us with all the particularity he does (Gen. xxiii. 17, 18. 20, *that upon weighing* 400 *shekels of silver, current money with the merchant, in the audience of the sons of Heth,* that *the field of Ephron, which was in Machpelah, which was before Mamre, the field, and the cave which was therein, and all the trees that were* in the open part of the *field, that were in all the borders round about, were made sure unto Abraham for a possession, in the presence of the children of Heth, before all that went in at the gate of the city:* and when *Abraham* had taken possession, by burying *Sarah*, *Moses* adds, *And the field, and the cave that is therein, were made sure* unto *Abraham for a* POSSESSION of a burying place, by the sons of Heth. And therefore also *Moses* acquaints us, Gen. xlix. 30. 32, that *Jacob* charges his sons to *bury him in the cave that is in Machpelah,* which *Abraham bought with the field of Ephron the Hittite for a possession of a burying place: The purchase* (as he adds) *of the field, and of the cave that is therein,* was from *the children of Heth.*

And in allusion to this purchase of *Abraham's* it is that I apprehend God afterwards ordered *Jeremiah* to purchase his *uncle Hanameel's fiela* in *Anathoth*, as a sign to the Jews that they should return from their captivity, Jer. xxxii. 7—17; to perpetuate their faith in both these covenants it was, that, according to their express order, *Abraham* was buried in Machpelah with *Sarah*, *Isaac* with *Rebecca*, and *Jacob* with *Leah;* and that *Joseph's* bones were preserved to be carried thither, when the children of *Israel* should go out of *Egypt*, Gen. l. 24, 25, 26. Exod. xiii. 19. Josh. xxiv. 32.

SECTION XXI.—*Abraham's obedience, when commanded to sacrifice Isaac, indicated his belief in the resurrection.*

That *Abraham* would expect this everlasting possession of *Canaan* after death, is yet the more probable; because it appears he was acquainted with the doctrine of the resurrection, by his being so ready to offer up *Isaac:* for without having been acquainted with that doctrine, he could not possibly have reconciled the contradictory appearances of Providence in relation to his only son, so as to have known what he was to do: for that, as on the one hand he was ordered to offer up *Isaac;* so on the other, God had told him, that the promise

of giving him such a *numerous seed*, as was to become *a great nation*, and of their enjoying *Canaan*, was to be through *Isaac*, his only son. How could *Abraham* have extricated himself out of this great perplexity, and have been ready to offer up his only son, notwithstanding that he was the sole heir of the promise, but (to express myself in words out of the epistle to the Hebrews) that *he reasoned with himself, that God was able to raise him up even from the dead; from whence also he received him in a figure?* Heb. xi. 17. 20. And that *Abraham* expected that God would raise *Isaac* from the dead, and even immediately after his offering him up, and restore him to *Abraham*, appears not only from consequences drawn from facts, which are urged to this purpose in the epistle to the *Hebrews;* but also from words in the history itself: for *Abraham said unto his young men, Abide you here with the ass, till I and the lad go yonder and worship,* AND COME BACK AGAIN TO YOU, Gen. xxii. 5.

These are some of the facts or passages which you demand; in which the future expectations of the *patriarchs* were expressed: facts extremely proper, from the circumstances of the world at that time, to express their expectations by, and to perpetuate them to the latest posterity.

SECTION XXII.—*Further proofs of Abraham's expectation of a resurrection.*

I hope you will excuse me for having been too particular here. I am very sensible, that a great deal less than I have said, would have led you into all my thoughts. But it being a very material point, and the way in which I have drawn my argument from the xviith of *Gen.*, though the ancient way of arguing from the Old Testament, yet being too much forgot, I was willing to put down the heads of all I have to say upon it.

I have in the course of this argument produced several passages of the New Testament to confirm the sense I have given to the 1st, 2d, 3d, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th verses of the xviith chapter of *Genesis:* without repeating them to you here, I will only add a few other authorities to support my interpretation of them, which I have not had occasion to mention hitherto.

1. The first is, what the seventh son in the *Maccabees* says to *Antiochus*, viz. my (six) *brethren, who now have suffered a short pain, are dead, under God's covenant of* EVERLASTING LIFE, 2 Mac. vii. 36. That must be the covenant to give *Abraham* and his seed *Canaan* for an everlasting possession. I do not see where else he could find it. And to this purpose *Josephus*

calls these seven sons, *children of the stock of Abraham.*

2. This everlasting possession of *Canaan* is what *Mary* may have been supposed to have meant in her *hymn*, when she says, *God hath holpen His servant Israel, in remembrance of His mercy, as He spake to our fathers, to Abraham and his seed for ever*, Luke i. 54, 55. The angel had told *Mary*, that God would give unto her Son *Jesus the throne of His father David, and that He should reign over all the house of Jacob for ever*, (*Jacob* being the last limitation in the promise, he is mentioned by *Mary*, and not *Abraham* or *Isaac*,) *and that of His kingdom there should be no end*, v. 32, 33. Here was a revelation of *Jesus*' universal and everlasting kingdom: and *Mary* in her *hymn* naturally connects with this everlasting kingdom *the helping His servant Israel* (in his low and distressed estate), *in remembrance* OF HIS MERCY, (taken from Psalm xcvi. 3, which is a prophecy of the universal kingdom of Christ,) as *He spake to our fathers, to Abraham and his seed for ever:* namely, Gen. xvii. 7, 8, when God promised the everlasting possession of *Canaan* to *Abraham* and his seed for ever. *Mary* therefore, with great propriety and beauty, connects the everlasting possession with the everlasting kingdom, the one being to be enjoyed under the other.

3. *Zacharias* refers to this everlasting posses-

sion yet more expressly in his *hymn;* when *he blesses the Lord as the God of* (or giver of an everlasting possession to) *Israel: who hath visited, and redeemed His people*, (by *Jesus*, as He did formerly by *Moses*,) *and hath raised up an horn of salvation* (*i. e.* in prophetic language a king of salvation) *in the house of His servant David, as He spake by the mouth of His holy prophets, ever since the world began; that we should be saved from our enemies, and the hands of all that hate us* (Gen. xxii. 17, and hereby), *to shew* MERCY TO OUR FATHERS. ("Promised," as Mr. Jos. Mede observes, is the insertion of our translators.) And *to remember his holy covenant*, viz. in Gen. xvii. (and which He confirmed by) *the oath that He sware to our father Abraham*, the father of all the faithful, Gen. xxii.; that *He would grant unto us* (viz. His faithful seed, &c.); and even of those *Gentiles, who sit in darkness, and in the shadow of death,* as well as to *us* (*Jews*), *whose feet are to be guided into the way of peace*, v. 79. So that, on the whole, *Zacharias* praises God in this *hymn* for visiting his people by a King, raised up according to the everlasting covenant with *David*, in order to perform the promise of the everlasting covenant with *Abraham*.

SECTION XXIII.—*The hymns of Mary and Zacharias, though they seem to refer only to the everlasting possession of Canaan, have couched under their obvious meaning an allusion to the heavenly inheritance.*

This I hope may serve to account entirely for the main thoughts, as well as the expressions of these *hymns;* and may shew, that *Mary* and *Zacharias* had not their minds running on a temporal kingdom to be then set up, as the *author of the grounds* insinuates, but on the *everlasting possession of Canaan,* under a king that was to reign over all nations, as well as the Jews, in righteousness (through the remission of sins), as well as in peace, according to the most sublime discoveries made to the patriarchs and prophets. And though we are not to expect in these hymns any clear expression of the distinct discoveries made by Christ; yet the Holy Ghost, who filled *Mary* and *Zacharias* when they uttered them, has couched them so, as that the heavenly inheritance may be taken in, since the everlasting possession of *Canaan* is to issue in it. Thus these rapturous hymns take in the great end that Jesus came into the world for; and was therefore the most fit to be the chief matter of them. And thus our Saviour understood the covenant made with *Abraham* in the xviith of *Genesis* in His argument with *the Sadducees;* for though He builds it on *God's calling*

himself, in *Moses'* history, THE GOD OF ABRAHAM, &c.; yet he plainly refers to Gen. xvii. 7, 8; that being the only place where God hath covenanted to be THE GOD OF ABRAHAM AND HIS SEED: which God there explains by adding, that He will give *Canaan to* HIM AND HIS SEED FOR AN EVERLASTING POSSESSION. And without a reference to Gen. xvii. 8, our Saviour's argument would have concluded only in favour of the resurrection of *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob;* but not for a resurrection of the just. This everlasting possession is also what *St. Paul* refers to, Rom. iv. 13, when he speaks of a promise God made to *Abraham, that he should be the* HEIR OF THE WORLD: by which word I take *Canaan* to be understood; κόσμος may as well signify *Canaan* as οἰκουμένη. As to the word itself, οἰκουμένη could not signify *Canaan*, but by a figure, that carries in it a very high compliment to that land. When *Canaan* shall be in the *paradisaical state*, how much better may it deserve to be called κόσμος, than οἰκουμένη, in the time of our Saviour and His *apostles;* when the nations of them that are saved shall walk in the light of its metropolis, and the *kings of the earth shall bring their glory and honour, and the glory and honour of the nations, into it?* Rev. xxi. 24. 27. Further, κόσμος often signifies in the New Testament the *Jewish* state. The Jewish state could scarce be thought to take place till

the *Israelites* came to a settlement in *Canaan.* They were but a camp before. *Κόσμος* then may by an easy figure signify the land where the Jewish kingdom and constitution took place, as in other texts of the New Testament it signifies the constitution that took place in that country. I think *St. Paul* also refers to this covenant, when he says further, that *the promise is sure to all the seed, not only to that* (seed) *which is of the law, but to that* (seed) *which is* (imitators) *of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all* (*Jews*, or *Gentiles*, that believe); and through whose title, as the original heir, or grantee, we are all to have any right to a share in that everlasting possession. That *St. Paul* here refers to the covenant in Gen. xvii. no body can doubt that compares both places. The Talmud has this question, Where has the resurrection of the dead any foundation in the law? The answer is, *Exodus* vi. 4, where it is said, *I established my covenant with them* (*Abraham, Isaac and Jacob*); for it is said with THEM, not with YOU: this it seems was the tradition of *Rabbi Simai.*—When *R. Gamaliel, Paul's* master, was asked by the *Sadducees*, whence he could prove the resurrection of the dead, he could not silence them till he produced Deut. xi. 21, where it is said, which *land the Lord sware unto* YOUR FATHERS TO GIVE THEM.

After all I have said, I must, however, still

agree with you, that "notwithstanding faith is the substance of things hoped for, and the evidence of things not seen; yet faith, in this notion of it, does not necessarily include any thing beyond this world; and that, as you justly observe, many of the instances in the xith of the *Hebrews* do not go beyond it. And I own too, that a belief of God's protection and blessing of the patriarchs, and their posterity in this world, might possibly have been a principle of obedience in some cases (though I think not in all); and that obedience, even from this principle, might have been acceptable to God, and might have engaged Him to bestow upon them a happiness of a higher nature than they expected, or He had expressly promised."

SECTION XXIV.—*Conclusion. The promises in Genesis, and the comment on them in Heb.* xi. *can only be reconciled by making the former refer to the everlasting possession of Canaan.*

But though I own all this true in the nature of the thing, and therefore that it might in some measure have been the case; yet from what I have said, you will easily see, that I apprehend this in fact was not the case: either as it is represented in *Genesis*, or in the comment that is made upon it in the xith of the Hebrews Temporal protection and felicity indeed are

mentioned but as lesser matters, and in order to the greater. But all is wound up in the everlasting covenant of an everlasting possession in *Canaan:* otherwise, as I have observed, *Ishmael's* temporal felicity is little, if at all, less than *Isaac's.* And yet the everlasting covenant was with *Isaac,* and in him was *Abraham's* seed called, and in *Jacob,* and his seed afterwards: and in his (*Jacob's*) seed I will endeavour to trace this everlasting covenant, through *Moses* and the *Judges;* through the law; the everlasting covenant with *David;* the prophecies of the prophets; and several particular passages up and down in the Old Testament. In the mean time all I shall add is, that the *author* of the epistle to the *Hebrews* says expressly, that *Abraham, Isaac* and *Jacob* themselves expected a better inheritance in a better country, and a city, whose maker and builder is God; and which they have not yet enjoyed: and that all the heroes of the Old Testament, and of the apocryphal times, though they, *through faith have obtained a good report,* yet *have not received the promise* that was the object of their faith; a lower faith indeed than ours; God having provided some better thing for us, which is the object of our faith, that *they without us should not be made perfect.*

After a letter of so unusual a length, I am

sure I need not make much excuse for breaking off before I have performed the promise I just now made you. I shall trouble you soon with the rest.

I am, Reverend Sir,

your most faithful, humble servant,

BARRINGTON.

Lord Barrington to Dr. Lardner.

Becket House, January 3d, 1728.

SECTION I.—*Summary of the reasoning in the preceding Letter, with observations respecting Moses, the Israelites, and David, in which the argument is pursued.*

Rev. Sir,—Hitherto I have endeavoured to shew the faith and expectations of the *antediluvian* and *postdiluvian* patriarchs concerning a future life by a resurrection, and on what they might found them: I hope I have shewn this from passages in their own history: though I have endeavoured to corroborate my explication of those passages by subsequent authorities, in the Old and New Testament. And I hope I have shewn in particular, that the faith of *Abraham's exceeding great reward* was founded in the original promise of *Canaan* to him, and to him and to his imitators after him, for an everlasting possession, in all their generations: a promise that was afterwards renewed to *Isaac* and *Jacob* respectively in their own persons. The promise to *Abraham* being the great original promise, has called for all my diligence to

explain, support, and vindicate it. But I shall not need to give you the like trouble about other facts and passages that follow.

I need not say any thing in particular here of *Joseph's* commandment about his bones, having had occasion to take notice of it before. The next person of distinction in the *Israelitish* story after him is *Moses*, and he seems to have had this everlasting possession of *Canaan* in his eye, when he refused to be called the son of *Pharaoh's* daughter; leaving the Egyptian court, to visit his brethren: though he could not have any thing else at that time in view, that could stand in competition with all the glory of that kingdom (save the afflictions the children of *Israel* underwent there), besides the recompense of reward (i. e. *Abraham's* reward, Gen. xv. 1, viz. the everlasting possession of *Canaan*). So the author of the epistle to the *Hebrews* justly infers from this fact, chap. ii. 24. And what other recompense of reward can we trace in the sacred history, that he could have had in view, previous to this fact? After this, the facts that shew this expectation, are the valour and resolution in getting and keeping the possession of *Canaan*, the pledge of the possession of that better country, which they had in their eye. This at least seems to have been the thought *of the author* of the epistle to the *Hebrews*, in this chapter, v. 32—35: for it was through faith

of a promise, which *Gideon, Barak, Sampson, Jepthah, David,* &c. have not received (v. 39), that he says, that they *subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness* (even rewarded with life), *out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens.*

Between *Moses'* leading the children of Israel out of *Egypt* and their taking possession of *Canaan,* under *Joshua* and the *Judges,* God erected the children of Israel into a kingdom at Sinai; condescending Himself to be their temporal or earthly King. The promised reward to their obedience was to be life. Not long life barely, as is promised in some places; but *life:* that is, life without death; that the term life imports: and I think the author of the Essay has fully proved that no less can be meant by it, vol. ii. 410. Life therefore, as promised by the law, was living on, without dying. But this life was to be but terrestrial animal life; which indeed was a suitable promise for an heavenly King, condescending to be an earthly prince, to make to the perfect obedience, that any of his civil subjects should pay to a perfect civil law, the full meaning of which I take to be the same as if God had said to them: "I have promised all Abraham's spiritual seed an everlasting possession in the paradisaical *Canaan* after death, Gen. xvii. But if you, whom I now take to be my people, and am carrying to give you the

possession of *Canaan* in its present state, according to my promise to your *fathers*, Gen. xv. and other like places; if you, I say, become perfectly obedient to the laws I now give you, you shall live on to possess and enjoy *Canaan* in its present state, till you come to the everlasting possession of it in its paradisaical state; which you will be entitled to only as the spiritual seed of *Abraham*." But though this sort of life was a reward fit for *God*, as their King, to annex to the perfect obedience that should be paid to His perfect law by His civil subjects; yet the Israelites soon found that they could not yield a perfect obedience to this law. They were animal men, fraught with appetites and passions which led them to transgress it; and the law forgave no transgression. From hence this law, that should have given life, brought death on the Israelites in particular, by virtue of its sanction (as the original threatening had brought it on all), and always brought an immature death upon them; that is to say, it brought death on the *Israelites* sooner, than it would have come on them, as men, barely by the original threatening. This was the great flaw in this constitution; or, in other words, in the law, as given to such subjects. Such an imperfect constitution shewed that it was not designed to be perpetual, and would naturally lead the *Israelites* to hope, that a good Being designed some time or other,

to erect another kingdom over them, which should be so constituted (or in other words), have such a law, and such motives as to secure life to them, as the reward of obedience; and that the kingdom God then erected was but introductory to that future one. This they might in some sort spell out from that very state of things. See the *Essay*, vol. ii. 451.

But this view was opened more fully afterwards; for in the time of *David*, and after, we see this hope of a resurrection break out in the faith that good men had in the *everlasting covenant* God made with *David* (*called the sure mercies of David*, Isaiah lv. 3. Acts xiii. 34). That his line and family should not fail till it ended in a son of his, the *true David*, that should reign, by virtue of a new and better covenant, over all *Israel* and the *Gentiles*, whose kingdom should bring in righteousness and peace, and of which there should be no end. See the *Essay*, vol. ii. 452. A thought that was carefully kept alive by the latter prophets, in order to support the hopes of good men under the threatening state of the *Jewish kingdom*, under their captivity, and under the low state of things on their return from it. And eternal life has always an inseparable connexion in *Scripture* with righteousness, as I have already observed to you.

Give me leave to observe to you, how the covenant with *David secures* and *confirms* the

covenant with *Abraham;* and what an analogy there is between them: God promises *Abraham,* that his natural *descendants* should possess *Canaan* in the state it then was: God promises *David* and his natural descendants, that the possession of *Canaan* in the state it then was should be secured to Abraham's seed by *David's* and his seed's possessing a throne over them: God promises to *Abraham,* and to all that should *walk before Him, and be perfect,* an everlasting possession of *Canaan:* God promises *David* and his *righteous Branch,* that He would cause to bud from him a perpetual reign over the faithful seed of *Abraham* in *Canaan;* or, which comes to the same thing, God promises the faithful seed of Abraham a son of *David* to reign over them for ever in righteousness and peace.

Both these are every where implied in the promise of perpetuating the kingdom in *David's* family; and in terms, Jer. xxxiii. 25, 26. Ezek. xxxvi. 28. As the first covenant with *Abraham* was a pledge of the performance of the last, so was also the first promise to *David* of his and his seed's reigning *over Israel,* a pledge of a future *David* (viz. his son's) reigning for ever over *Israel,* 2 Sam. vii. 5—10. 12—17. 1 Chron. xvii. 4—9. xv. 9, 10. As the everlasting possession of *Canaan* in its *paradisaical* state by the faithful seed had for its pledge the possession of *Canaan* by his natural descend-

ants; and that first in promise, and then in fact, in the fourth generation: so also the everlasting reign of *David's* Son in *Canaan*, in its paradisaical state, had for its pledge *David* and his natural descendants sitting on his throne, and that first in promise, and then in fact, for about 470 years, to the burning of the temple.—As God calls this last covenant with *Abraham* an *everlasting covenant;* so He does this with David, 1 Sam. vii. 6. xxiii. 15. 1 Chron. xvii. 12. 14. Ezek. vii. 26. As God's temporal and everlasting covenant with Abraham was to descend to his seed *through Isaac;* so God's temporal and everlasting covenant with David was to descend to his seed through *Solomon.* As God confirms the covenant to *Abraham* by circumcision; so God confirms the covenant with *David* by the temple built for an house for Him, as a mark of his settled continuance and perpetual rest in the land of *Canaan,* 2 Sam. vii. 11—17. 1 Chron. xvii. 10—15. God confirms both His covenants to Abraham by swearing *by his life;* and so likewise He ratifies both covenants to *David* by swearing by His *holiness,* Psalm lxxxix. 35. cxxxii. 11, 12. But there is this difference between them; that as God's first covenant with *Abraham* was absolute, promising Canaan to *Abraham's* seed in the fourth generation, for *Abraham's* past piety; but his second

covenant, promising the everlasting possession of *Canaan* to him and his seed, was conditional: so, on the contrary, God's first covenant with *David* was conditional, viz. that if his seed should observe His laws, one of them should never fail to sit on his throne; and the second covenant was absolute; viz. that one of his line should at last arise, who should reign over all the house of Israel (or all true *Israelites*) for ever.

This everlasting covenant with *Abraham*, promising him the everlasting possession of *Canaan*, gives *Abraham* occasion to worship the Lord, as the EVERLASTING GOD, Gen. xxi. 23. And this everlasting possession promised to *Abraham* and his seed, and secured by the everlasting covenant with *David*, of a perpetual kingdom over the land of *Canaan*, under one of his line, gives occasion to several expressions of the Old Testament of the like kind; as, *the way* EVERLASTING, Psalm cxxxix. 24; that is, the way that will lead to *Canaan*, as an everlasting possession, in opposition to any *wicked way, which might be in him, David*, and which shall perish, Psalm i. 6, EVERLASTING RIGHTEOUSNESS, Psalm cxix. 22. 24 (or a righteousness by which one may LIVE everlastingly, viz. in *Canaan*, as an everlasting possession), GOD'S EVERLASTING MERCY, Psalm c. 5; GOD'S EVERLASTING KINDNESS, Isaiah liv. 8; or HIS EVER-

LASTING LOVE, Jer. xxxi. 3; His EVERLASTING covenant, Jer. xxxiii. 37. 41. Ezek. xxxvi. 36; EVERLASTING JOY, Isaiah xxx. 10. lxi. 7; EVERLASTING SALVATION, Isaiah xlv. 17. li. 6. 8; and EVERLASTING LIGHT, Isaiah lx. 19, 20. All these places point this way; but the last more especially: when (as the *prophet* says) *the people,* viz. of Israel, being ALL RIGHTEOUS, AND SO INHERITING THE LAND FOR EVER; *the sun shall no more be thy light by day, neither for brightness shall the moon give thee light:* But the Lord *shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God thy glory.* Compare Rev. xxi. 23. 26. This is the state of things that shall take place, when God, who for the sins of his people *Israel,* and their kings, hath given their kingdom to the heathen, under the four beasts or four great successive monarchies (except seventy weeks, cut out of that long line of time, in order to the birth, life, sacrifice and covenant of the *Messiah*) shall, when these times of *the Gentiles shall be fulfilled,* consume the fourth and last beast, giving his body to the burning flame: and the *Son of man* shall have a *dominion given Him by the Ancient of days; which is an* EVERLASTING, as well as universal, *dominion;* under whom the *saints shall possess it,* Dan. vii.

SECTION II.—*On the occasion and meaning of* Psalm xxxii. &c.

The author of the *Essay* took *David* as an instance of one whom God justified under the law, to eternal life, on his being an imitator of *Abraham:* he quotes Psalm xxxii. 1, 2, for it. You except to this proof, and your exception deserves my attention: you think that *Psalm* was penned on the occasion of *Nathan's* message. That however seems to me at least doubtful and uncertain. But if it was, should one imagine that the BLESSEDNESS David there speaks of, related only to a reprieve from death? *Blessedness* in Scripture language, I think, must signify the removing of the original curse, and restoring the original blessing, in part or in whole, and it must signify the restoring it in whole, when a *blessedness* is mentioned; that is the effect of *righteousness*, or of not imputing *iniquity*, or the reward of sincerity, or the reward (in his language) *of a mind without guile;* for that blessedness must be life, the inseparable reward of righteousness; and not barely a short reprieve from death. And since all die, this blessedness must include a resurrection to life; and so in effect *St. Paul* interprets it, Rom. iv. 6. 10. 13.

But though I differ from you about this xxxiid *Psalm*, yet I must agree with you about *Job*

and the 16th Psalm: for I own my poor eyes cannot discover any resurrection in the former, with all the help Bishop Sherlock has afforded us: nor can I see a general resurrection in the latter; for the reasons you give, however, I think it is very fully expressed in other *Psalms* as well as in Psalm xxxii.: particularly in very clear terms in Psalms xlix, 14. 15, lxxiiid, and the xviith, 14, 15. But I choose to consider the two last towards the close of my letter: and the lxxiiid in particular, because you seem to me to consider that *Psalm* as an objection to my hypothesis. And it is but fit that I should endeavour to answer that objection before I pretend to serve myself of it as an argument.

The xlixth *Psalm* is composed to comfort a good man against the fear of death, v. 5. To do it, the *Psalmist* in the first place says, that death is unavoidable: that the greatest riches will not purchase redemption from the grave, v. 6. 10: that wisdom will not do it: for that wise men die as well as the simple and the wicked, v. 10: but that there is still a wide difference between them; for whilst the last think of no other immortality than what houses they build, or their dwelling places and lands, called after their own names, will give them, and in which their posterity follow their examples, notwithstanding its manifest folly; since it is

plain that they are laid in their grave, like sheep (the weakest of all cattle), and that death shall feed on them, and utterly consume them from those dwellings, in which their pride lies; so, on the other hand, the upright, whom they despised, shall have DOMINION (the word used Gen. i. 26. 28, of *Adam,* a son of God) over them, when they wake from death in the morning; when God, as will be the good man's case, will deliver his soul from the power of *hades,* and afterwards receive him to Himself as He did *Enoch,* Gen. v. 24, and *Elijah,* 2 Kings ii. 9, 10. 12; and to this purpose the *Chaldee paraphrase* interprets this place. The moral of the poem concludes it, v. 16—20, which is, that no man should envy another barely for his riches and prosperity; for that it is but shortlived; since death puts an end to it, notwithstanding the applause the rich and the great may meet with here; and that a man in honour, without true wisdom, will perish like a beast, and never see light.

SECTION III.—*Observation on the hope of Solomon,* Prov. iii. 18.

Proverbs iii. 18, *Solomon* says of *Wisdom,* that *she is a tree of life;* i. e. everlasting life *to them that lay hold on her;* alluding to the tree of life in *Eden.* This I think must be the

meaning of *Solomon* here; since he had before just said of *Wisdom*, v. 16, 17, *That* LENGTH OF DAYS ARE IN HER RIGHT HAND, *and in her left riches and honour;* and that *all her ways are pleasantness, and all her paths are peace. So*, Prov. xi. 30, where he says yet more expressly, that *the fruit of the righteous is a tree of life, and he that winneth souls is wise.* (Comp. Dan. xii. 3; and see the version of the LXX.) This seems to be a most manifest allusion to the tree of life in *Eden;* and so *Josephus* brings in the *mother* of *the seven sons* quoting this text. And though the resurrection is not so clearly expressed, Eccles. xii. 13, 14, as in the place I have just now quoted; yet it is plainly hinted there, as the conclusion of all the reasonings of *Solomon*, in that book, about every thing in human life: which is this; *that to fear God and keep His commandments was the whole duty of man.* "For a judgment shall pass at last on every work, even the most secret, whether it be good or evil." The doctrine of the judgment must suppose a resurrection from death, in order to that judgment.

SECTION IV.—*The notions of the later prophets concerning a future life.*

I think the later prophets speak of a resurrection to a future life, agreeably to what I ob-

served in relation to the *antediluvian* and *post-diluvian patriarchs*, in my former letter; and agreeably to what I have observed in this concerning *Moses*, the *judges*, the *law*, *the everlasting covenant with David*, and several *incidental expressions* up and down the Old Testament (being expressions that are consequential from these two everlasting covenants), as also in several places of the *Psalms*, *Proverbs*, *Ecclesiastes*: but if we just dip into the prophetic books, we shall find them speak of the resurrection more fully and expressly than any of the former.

I will only take liberty just to refer you to *Isaiah* xxv. 7, 8, and xxvi. 13, 14. 24, 25, as well known places to this purpose: one of them being quoted by St. Paul in that view, 1 Cor. xv. 54. But chap. li. 6. 8, the prophet speaks *of a salvation, that shall be for ever, even after the heaven shall vanish away like smoke, and the earth shall wax old as a garment, and they that dwell therein shall die in like manner:* and speaks of this salvation of some in opposition to others, whom *the moth and the worm shall consume*, v. 8. I think this text the more to the purpose, because *St. Peter* seems to have borrowed his expression from hence, when he describes the destruction of this world by fire, in order to the new heaven and earth's taking place, wherein dwells righteousness, 2 Peter iii. 12, 13. *Isaiah* also speaks to the then children of *Israel*, saying,

ARISE, SHINE, FOR THY LIGHT IS COME, AND THE GLORY OF THE LORD IS RISEN UPON THEE. The 1st, 2d, 3d, 4th, 11th, 19th, and 22d verses of this chapter of Isaiah should be compared with Revelation xxi. 22. 27. For as *St. Peter* borrows his expressions about the new heaven and the new earth from the former place of *Isaiah;* so *St. John* takes his expressions, Rev. xxi. from this last, the better to describe the glory of the new Jerusalem. *Ezekiel* says still more particularly, that after he had seen the vision of the dry bones being covered with sinews, flesh and skin, and being breathed upon, so as to live again, and stand upon their feet, and be an exceeding great army, God said to him, *These bones are* (or represent) *the whole house of Israel.* And bids him prophesy, and say, *Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel. And ye shall know that I am the Lord, when I have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you up out of your graves, And shall put my spirit in you, and ye shall live, and I shall place you in your own land: then shall ye know that I the Lord have spoken, and performed it, saith the Lord,* Ezek. xxxvii. 1—15, 16—28. I own all this seems to me to be a literal description of the first resurrection to the everlasting possession of *Canaan.* 1st, Because

the expressions, v. 24. 28, seem to be those which are used by *St. John* concerning the first resurrection, Rev. xx. 4, the state of which is described ch. xxi. 3. 2d, Because, as the following chapters of *Ezekiel* are a prophecy about *Gog* and *Magog*, so we find a like prophecy about them at the end of the thousand years, after the first resurrection, Rev. xx. 8. 11. If this be a literal description of the first resurrection, no text of the *Old Testament* can be more full to my purpose. But if it be figurative, and only signify the return of the Jews from their captivity, considered as their graves; yet I think it will prove that the doctrine of the resurrection was a received doctrine at that time; or else a metaphor would never have been taken from it to describe the return of the Jews out of their captivity. Hosea xiii. 14, introduces God saying, *I will ransom them from the power of the grave: I will redeem them from death: O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, (or hades) I will be thy destruction; repentance shall be hid from mine eyes.* This text, Sir, you know, St. Paul seems to allude to, after giving us the most particular account of the resurrection of the just that we have in all the New Testament, 1 Cor. xv. 55: nor could he have made a more pertinent or elegant allusion. For nothing can ransom from death, or redeem from the grave, but a resurrection: and there can be no plague

for death, nor destruction for *hades*, but immortality; and therefore *St. John*, after the resurrection, sees death and hades cast into the burning lake, Rev. xx. 14. Daniel, however, speaks in some particulars still more clearly of this matter, Dan. xii. 2, 3, even if the xxxviith of Ezekiel is to be taken literally. But I shall do no more than quote this text in *Daniel*, as I have done little more about that in *Hosea*, because you acknowledge the doctrine of the resurrection was sufficiently understood in *Daniel's* time, and after. I should think even from his mentioning it, that it was a doctrine known before, at least such are his discoveries as to most other points contained in his books; viz. not so much an entirely new discovery of what was altogether unknown, as a more particular and clear revelation of what had not been so distinctly discovered before. I should from hence therefore conclude, that though *Daniel* spoke of the resurrection more clearly than the former prophets; yet that, however, it had been the known doctrine before. Indeed it had been so all along; having been first (to recapitulate what I have said) only couched in these terms, *God* (i. e. *Father*), *sons or children of God, likeness and image of God*,[1] in opposition to the *sons of men*

[1] These terms came to be used, and to the purpose I have mentioned, from the circumstances of the first man,

born after their likeness, and in their image, heirs of toil and death; and to the seed of *the serpent*, heirs of his curse: exemplified in some sort in the *translation of Enoch;* shadowed forth in the salvation of *Noah*, and the covenant with *him*. It was also couched in God's being expressly called the God (or Father) of them. But more especially in God's *blessing Abram and all the families of the earth in him*, in becoming *Abram's exceeding great reward*, in *counting his faith for righteousness;* and especially in becoming *Abram's God* (and Father) by covenant, was to give *him and them Canaan for an everlasting possession*, and was signed and sealed by circumcision: a covenant which was renewed afterwards with *Isaac* and *Jacob* respectively. From the time of *Moses'* being sent to *Pharaoh*, this doctrine was couched in the term *people of God* (in opposition to the wicked, or the idolatrous heathen, who worshipped *Satan*, reserved

who was *created by God, in His likeness, after His image*, and was vested with dominion; and though he was created naked, and continued so till the woman was created, Gen. ii., yet soon *after had a garment;* which when he was deprived of, on eating of the forbidden tree, he became afraid (expressing thereby his guilt and the loss of his dominion), who was placed in the *blissful garden of Eden*, in the midst of which was the *tree of life*, which he rejected, and also the *tree of death*, of which he ate, through the seduction of the serpent.

in darkness to the judgment of the great day, instead of God), and pointed out by the imperfection and antitype of the *Mosaic constitution.* It is couched in several parts of the *Psalms*, *Proverbs*, and *Ecclesiastes*, in the terms, *judgment, God's receiving any to Himself*, (as He did *Enoch and Elijah*,) *glory, blessedness, not imputing iniquity.* This doctrine was at length couched *in the everlasting covenant with David:* and as, from the everlasting covenant with *Abraham*, it was couched in the term *everlasting God*, Gen. xxi. 33; so, from the everlasting covenant with *Abraham*, and the everlasting covenant with *David*, as confirming the everlasting covenant with *Abraham*, it is couched in the terms, *everlasting mercy, kindness, love, covenant, joy, salvation, light, life, portion, inheritance* (the last in opposition to *the portion of the wicked*), *and in the kingdom of the true David*, which was to bring in *righteousness*, and consequently life. It is also expressed figuratively by *awakening in the morning* after the sleep of death; and at last, clearly and literally, in several passages of *Isaiah*, *Ezekiel*, *Daniel* and *Hosea.*

SECTION V.—*The doctrine of a resurrection understood by the apocryphal writers, and by the Jews who were contemporaries of our Lord and His apostles.*

And we must not wonder, that by the later and clearer discoveries of a resurrection in the prophets, and which reflected great light on the more obscure discoveries that had been made of it before; we must not wonder, I say, that the apocryphal writers came to speak of it more frequently, and more clearly than the more ancient Jewish writers had done; particularly the author of *Wisdom*, chap. ii. 16. 24. chap. iii. 1. 4. 7, 8. chap. v. 1. 4, 5. 15, and the seventh son in the Maccabees: thus I should choose to account for the difference between the ancient and later Jewish writers before our *Saviour* concerning the resurrection, and the state that follows it. From these later writers it became the doctrine that was generally received by the *Jewish* nation in our *Saviour's* time, and before, and was very well understood; as appears by the *Pharisees'* approbation of our Saviour's argument for the resurrection, Mark xii. 28, and by the young man's question to our Saviour, Luke x. 25, and by *Martha's* conversation with him upon it, John xi. 24. 28.

SECTION VI.—*The argument for the resurrection further confirmed from Acts* iii. 21, *and particularly from* 2d *Peter* iii. 13, *and Rev.* xx. 21, xxii. 1. 6.

I might make several quotations from the New Testament, besides those I have made up and down in this letter, in order to prove that the doctrine of the resurrection was understood in the time of our *Saviour* and His *Apostles,* to be the doctrine of the Old Testament, had I not anticipated myself in my former letter, when I endeavoured to trace the everlasting possession of *Canaan* in the New Testament writers. I must beg you therefore to cast your eye back to them; for every text in the New Testament that speaks of *Abraham* and all his seed's possessing *Canaan,* or refers to it, will serve my present purpose as well as it did the purpose for which I then brought them, since dead men cannot have an everlasting possession in *Canaan* by any other way than a resurrection. I will only add one text to those I quoted there, viz. Acts iii. 21, where *St. Peter,* speaking of our Saviour, says, *whom the heavens must receive until the time of the* RESTITUTION *of all things, which God has spoken of by the mouth of his holy* PROPHETS, EVER SINCE THE WORLD BEGAN. This agrees well with the notions which I have supposed in my former letter to have been entertained by *Adam* and his immediate descendants, as well as by

Abraham, Isaac, and *Jacob* afterwards, of living again in a paradisaical state. Where else the *times of the restitution of all things, spoken of by the prophets from the beginning of the world,* will be found, I own I do not know.

But though I have endeavoured to shew that a future state by a resurrection has been spoken of, in some measure, by all holy men, and prophets, from the beginning of the world, and most clearly by *Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel,* and *Daniel,* chap. vii.; yet I must take the liberty to add, that it is described still with much greater certainty, clearness, and particularity, by *St. John,* 2 Ep. iii. 13; and above all, by *St. John,* Rev. xx. 21. xxii. 1. 6, where the state of the first resurrection, and the thousand years' reign of and with *Christ* in a paradisaical state of the earth (the centre and metropolis of which is to be the *heavenly Jerusalem*) is described in a more lively manner, chap. xxii. 15, and as a state previous to the general resurrection and judgment. I apprehend this portion (viz. ch. xxii. 15) should be read after chap. xxi. and chap. xxii. 1—6, if we would enter into the precise order of *St. John's* visions, notwithstanding it precedes them. The like method must be used to settle the order of his visions in other parts of his book; as has been observed by those who have been the best acquainted with it.

SECTION VII.—*The necessity of a resurrection of the spiritual seed of Abraham inferred from the dreadful punishments of the wicked.*

Thus I have taken the liberty to point out to you, in what places of the Old Testament, I apprehend, the inheritance of a son of God to be implied or expressed, from the creation of man down to Christ, who has set the adoption of Jews and Gentiles in the clearest light. But it may serve to illustrate this point the better, if we take into consideration the remarkable judgments of God on His enemies. It seems to have been a Jewish tradition that the *devil* and his *angels*, the first of all beings that revolted from the allegiance to their Maker, having *been cast down from their bright and glorious mansions, are reserved in chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day.* Terrible destruction has ever since overtaken those who have been his imitators, whether they were of the family or kingdom of the *devil* or the notoriously disobedient in the family or kingdom of God. Thus *Cain* and his descendants had a particular curse as the seed of the *serpent.* And the blessed descendants of *Seth* having at length despised the inheritance of the sons of God, and mingled themselves with the accursed descendants of *Cain*, were overwhelmed with a common destruction, for their common impiety and

unbelief, God saving only *Noah* and his family alive, whom alone He had found righteous in that generation. The inhabitants of *Sodom* and *Gomorrah*, part of the accursed family of *Canaan*, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire; while just Lot was delivered, though his wife, who had escaped the fire, was yet afterwards made a perpetual monument of unbelief. The rest of the accursed race of *Canaan* (being at the first ten nations, and at last as it should seem reduced to seven) are devoted by God to an utter destruction; and some of Shem's posterity are brought to inherit the land in their stead. *Korah, Dathan* and *Abiram* are swallowed up alive for their notorious rebellion, most presumptuously and contumaciously persisted in against the express order of the Lord by the hand of *Moses*. And not to mention any other particular desolations brought upon the Jewish nation in their several judgments and captivities, or on those heathen nations that God made the rod of His anger, or the staff in His hand of His indignation against them, of which the prophets and historians of those times are full; or the remarkable vengeance that is yet to overtake the *fourth beast* (in *St. John's style the beast and the false prophet*, and in *St. Paul's, the man of sin and perdition*), we are assured in general, that whilst *the righteous Lord loveth righteousness, and with*

favour upholdeth the upright; snares, fire, brimstone, and an horrible tempest shall be the portion of the wicked.

What upon all these instances of God's just vengeance would men conclude about God, from the natural notions they had of Him, and from the observations that arose to them, either from history, or their own experience, or from God's immediate discoveries? would they think that He was a being that delighted in judgment, and was estranged from mercy? or the contrary? If the latter, as they certainly must, would they imagine that God would avenge Himself thus terribly of the wicked, by hurling them into amazing and irrecoverable destruction, as they saw in several instances was their lot, and that He did not intend such an inheritance or reward for His faithful children and subjects, as should bear a proportion to all this eternal perdition of ungodly men? And since they saw no such proportionable reward and inheritance allotted to good men in this life, would they not be led, even by these amazing desolations of the wicked, to expect an everlasting inheritance and reward in another for the righteous?

SECTION VIII.—*The foregoing opinion confirmed from the chronological order in which the discoveries of the future inheritance stand.*

If you would not think me too *rabbinical*, I would endeavour to confirm this sketch of some of the dispensations of God to mankind, which may be considered as so many different great discoveries and confirmations of our inheritance as sons of God, from one observation more, taken from the chronological order in which these discoveries stand. From *Adam*, the created son of God (and on whom, upon his forfeiture of that relation, the threatening of death passed into a sentence), unto Enoch, who was translated, are seven generations. From Enoch unto ABRAHAM, the grantee of the everlasting possession of *Canaan*, are fourteen generations: from *Abraham* to *David*, the grantee of the everlasting kingdom, are fourteen generations: from *David* to *Jeconiah*, the last possessor of that temporal grant, as the pledge of the spiritual and everlasting grant (and to which time *Solomon's* temple stood), are fourteen generations; and from *Jeconiah*, when *Daniel* and the *minor prophets* began their clearer predictions of the everlasting kingdom, to Christ, the everlasting and perpetual King of it, are fourteen generations. It is not fit to be too bold with numbers here, where we see but in part, and but

through a glass darkly; yet it is certain that all God's works are done in *number, weight, and measure;* and I do not doubt, but when we come to have the whole scene of God's dispensations opened to us, we shall see beautiful proportions in the chronological order of things, as well as in all other orders of them. But notwithstanding the caution one ought to have in these matters, I have ventured the rather to submit this thought to you (which I was afraid at first might be singular), because I find, since I have in three of them St. Matthew's *authority*, in some sort, to support me, ch. i. 17, the periods which I have mentioned seem to be the great epochs in the sacred chronology of the *Old Testament*, perhaps to point out to us the periods in which our inheritance in a future life have been opened and confirmed. And the measure of the chronology is not years, but generations, or the life of man. I should think, that if the sacred chronology of the Old Testament were considered in that manner and method, some observations of consequence might from thence offer themselves to us, both in relation to the views we may take of the times past or to come: for I cannot but observe that with the last fourteen generations, save one, the times of the Gentiles (heathen) began, which is the beginning of Daniel's great calendar of time. And the last fourteen generations end where

the *stone is cut out of the mountain*, and which is at last *to become a great mountain*, and *fill the whole* earth.

I have owned to you, in my former letter, that I did not consider the resurrection in the Old Testament as a resurrection to a paradisaical *Eden* or *Canaan*, till lately, but as a resurrection to the heavenly state. What misled me was, that I saw a resurrection in the most ancient books of the Old Testament, but I did not think of a resurrection to *Eden* or *Canaan;* but only of a resurrection to such an heavenly life as the New Testament describes, with which my idea of a resurrection was, I own, immediately connected, though unhappily; and in which I even now apprehend the resurrection to *Canaan* is at last to end, as the completion of all God's dispensations to mankind.

SECTION IX.—*Summary of the foregoing argument.*

That I may give you the less trouble in favouring me with your opinion upon the whole of what I have troubled you with about the future inheritance of the sons of God, I would put it all together in this manner. I apprehend that from the fall to *Abraham*, good men were not without expectations of being received by God, and translated to Eden, when they should be raised from the dead, in such sort of bodies

as *Adam* had there. From *Abraham* to *Christ*, good men had a more certain hope of a resurrection to *Canaan;* (and from *David's* time, under a son of his, who should reign in righteousness and peace, and extend his rule to the *Gentiles;*) and therefore, it is most likely, thought they should enjoy it in a more than a *paradisaical state* (especially from the description of some of the prophets), and in such a body as *Adam* had had in *Eden.* But it is from *Christ* and His apostles alone that we learn, that after a preparation by this paradisaical state (the centre and *metropolis* of which will be the New Jerusalem, in the land of *Canaan*) ALL which He, *that sits on the throne* says, *shall be* INHERITED *by him that overcometh* (πάντα ταῦτα, as the best copies have it), *and I will be his* GOD, *and he shall be my* SON, Rev. xxi. 7; after a preparation by this paradisaical state, I say, we shall at last *be* CHANGED; and in spiritual, powerful, glorious, celestial, incorruptible bodies, like to the angels derived from Christ, and fashioned after His, mount the air, be wafted up to the *third heavens* (that is the heaven that is above the airy, and the starry heaven, where God is represented as sitting on a throne, where Christ is seated at His right hand, and surrounded with an innumerable host of glorious angels), from whence the Word came, and whither, since He became incarnate, He is gone before (*to His*

Father, and our Father, to His God, and our God), to prepare a place for us, in a house where there are sufficient mansions for all the children of God, and whence He will come, to take us to Himself, that we may be with Him, to behold his glory. Thus He is the first that has told us, *and if it were not so, He would not have told us.* Thus, on the whole, we see, that the *patriarchs* as well as the *good men* among the Jewish people, all died in faith of a *future promise, which they had not received;* [viz. the everlasting possession of a paradisaical *Canaan;*] *God having provided some better thing for us* [*Christians*] (viz. *heaven*, to be enjoyed in an heavenly body, far better than a paradisaical *Canaan*, to be enjoyed in an earthly body), that they *without us might not be made perfect*, Heb. xi. 39, 40.

This recapitulation may serve to show that beautiful gradation, which has been observed by God, in opening to us the nature of the inheritance of the sons of God, and reserves a just distinction to that clearer and fuller discovery of it, which one should expect to be made by the only-begotten Son of God Himself, *the image of the invisible Father, the Heir of every creature;* and which is but like the gradual discovery of other points in Scripture, that have been observed by the curious.

SECTION X.—*Observations on Dr. Lardner's opinion respecting the denunciations in the Psalms.*

But I own I do not remember that the resurrection of the wicked is ever revealed by any of the sacred writers before *Daniel:* and therefore I think your accounting for the hearty curses in the *Psalms*, from the respective authors not knowing a future state, very just, as well as extremely ingenious, if it be but restrained to the future state of the wicked. But *Christ* and His apostles have set this matter in a much fuller light than *Daniel* did, and have greatly enhanced the value of the inheritance of the sons of God, by letting us see that it is at the same time a *salvation* from that dreadful *wrath* which is the portion of the wicked.

SECTION XI.—*Dr. Lardner's opinion, that there is evidence in the* [lxxiiid] *Psalm of Asaph against a future state, considered.*

But I see, Sir, you have not only thought that there is no proof of a future state from the ancient books of the Old Testament, but that there is proof in them (at least consequential proof) against it. Your consequence is drawn from the disturbance that the promiscuous dealings of Providence in this life gave

good men about *David's* time. Asaph, indeed, I find, was once extremely disturbed at this appearance, if the lxxiiid *Psalm* be of his composing. Nay, he puts the difficulty stronger, and supposes the wicked to be the prosperous men, and the righteous the afflicted. And you argue that this *phenomenon* would not have perplexed them so much if they had expected a future state. Whether this was a problem that puzzled all other good men of those times as much as it did *Asaph*, I cannot say. But if it was a common difficulty then, yet it will not follow, that a resurrection to the everlasting possession of *Canaan* had never been revealed to *Abraham*. That was an expectation that after it had been once raised by revelation, would not fail of being kept alive among the *patriarchs* sojourning in *Canaan* as a strange land, and that never thought of any better habitation in it than a tent, but yet might be very much weakened in the *plenty of Goshen;* and after that more in the brick kilns of *Egypt*, where the children *of Israel* learnt idolatry and hard labour at the same time. It might be further sunk after the possession of *Canaan* came to *Abraham's* seed; and more especially in the midst of the high prosperity that country enjoyed in *David's* reign. A future state of rewards and punishments might have been spelt out by the *Israelites*, without resurrection, from the appearance of things, as you

yourself think it was by the heathen philosophers. Whatever then hindered men from spelling that out, by the help of their reason from the appearance of things, might have made them love the doctrine of the resurrection; though it had been revealed to their *ancestors*, and fully believed by them. But though this was a difficulty with *Asaph*, yet he got rid of it by the belief of a resurrection and a future judgment. I think there is something in this *Psalm of Asaph* that must lead one to think so. If that shall appear, I shall not barely answer the objection from the problem in this Psalm, but make it a strong argument on my side. He says, v. 15, "that if he should say, that religion was unprofitable and vain, he should *offend against the generation of God's children*," who are ever considered in Scripture, not only as like God, but entitled to an inheritance from Him. And when he rejected this thought, to which the success of the wicked tempted him, where, and how did he get the solution of this difficulty? By musing in the field, or in his closet, and making deep reflections on the course of Providence in this life, which he had before observed, and from whence his difficulty arose? No; but by going to the *sanctuary*, where the five books of Moses were read and explained, and where he conversed with wise men that understood them. There it was that he learnt

the *end of the wicked.* What end? "That they were often *healthy and prosperous, without any mixture of those troubles and diseases, which were often in a manner the whole lot of the children of God? And that at last they had no bands in their death!*" This end of the wicked was his difficulty, and therefore could not be the solution of it. Nor, above all, was it a solution that he was likely to meet with in the *sanctuary.* But the END of the wicked, that he learnt in the *sanctuary,* and that set him right, was (as we may learn from his *Psalm*), "that they were in their prosperity only set in a slippery place, from whence they would soon slide to irrecoverable destruction: that if they had not the bodily pangs of death, that good men often had, yet they were seized with the terrors, that men must be utterly consumed with, who knew that death would make a final end of them. And that when God, who now appeared as one asleep, by letting things go on in this seemingly preposterous manner, should awake to judgment, (so the *Chaldee* paraphrase interprets it,) He should in wrath despise their image or their shadow: whereas that a good man, or one that was a true *Israelite,* (*of a clean heart,* or one of the *children of God,*) though afflicted, was held up by the right hand under his afflictions, and directed by God's counsel to grow wise and better by his afflictions; till God should RE-

CEIVE him, as He did *Enoch* and *Elijah* [*to* or *with*] GLORY: namely, the glory which is the garment of God's children, and the badge of their dominion. And therefore when a *true Israelite's* flesh, and even his heart came to fail him, God would be the strength of his *heart*, and HIS PORTION [or inheritance] FOR EVER."

From hence it is, that he begins his PSALM as he does, *Truly God is good to Israel*, [namely] *to such* [of them] *as are of a clean heart!* This is to be considered as the conclusion that he had come to, from all his reasoning, that he had had before, and then gives us an account of in the *Psalm*, and into which he abruptly breaks out in the beginning. Now why may he be supposed to have chosen here the word *Israel*, rather than the many words that might have filled that place, but that every *Israelite* was a son of God, as he had a title to an inheritance in *Canaan*, Exodus iv. 22; and that every *Israelite*, that was of a clean heart, was in a better sense *a son of God*, and was entitled to a better portion, even in paradisaical *Canaan*, as an *everlasting possession?* It is remarkable that Asaph is at last astonished at his own folly, inattention and stupidity, which had been the great source of his difficulty, v. 22.

David seems to express the same thoughts in his prayer, Psalm xvii. 14, 15, that *Asaph* does, Psalm xxiii. 23, 24. 26. The learned *Ainsworth's*

version differs little from ours; and that is the thought, if our version, or his, be just. He says, *I shall behold thy face* (God's) IN RIGHTEOUSNESS (with which life is ever connected) *when I awake, I shall be satisfied with* THY LIKENESS (the likeness of God, in which *Adam* was created, and which may be considered as his inheritance in the filial relation he stood to God), and this he opposes to *the men of this world, who have their* PORTION IN THIS LIFE. The *Hebrew* doctors interpret this *likeness* or image, by the *shechinah* or *glory*. See Rabbi Menachem on Lev. x.

The like difficulty with this (in the lxxiiid Psalm) seems to be considered in the xxxviith Psalm, and it has much the same solution there: particularly v. 10, 11; *For*, says the Psalmist, *yet a little while, and the wicked shall not be: yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and it shall not be. But the meek shall inherit the earth; and shall delight themselves in abundance of peace.* This sure can never be the state in this scene of things. It can be only when, as he says, v. 18, of the *upright, that their* INHERITANCE *shall be* FOR EVER; viz. in *Canaan*, given to *Abraham* and his spiritual seed (all the upright or *perfect*) for an everlasting possession: or, as the Psalmist says, v. 20, *when the wicked* (that is, all the wicked) *shall perish, and* (all) *the enemies of the Lord consume;* as *the fat of lambs into smoke;* or when the time comes, that it shall be

said, Psalm lxviii., 1, 2, *Let God arise, let* (all) *His enemies be scattered: let* (all) *them also that hate Him flee before Him! As smoke is driven away, so drive them away: as wax melteth before the fire, so let* (all) *the wicked perish at the presence of God.*

SECTION XII.—*All the dispensations of God have, throughout, a unity of plan.*

I should have the greatest reason to ask your pardon for a letter of this length, were it not on a subject of so great importance as all the dispensations of God to mankind. You see I have ventured to correct the *Essay*, that bears that title, in the dispensation of *Abraham*, and a little in the dispensation of *Moses*, and have endeavoured then to support it the best I can, and to answer the objections with which you have attacked it so vigorously. If you think on the whole that this scheme of God's dispensations is the true one, I shall then begin to think one may rest satisfied with it. If you do not, let me beg you to make a sketch of them for me. I think, if they are of God, a thread must run through them. You allow "that God had all along a view to the great design of the gospel dispensation; and that the spiritual and heavenly blessings to be bestowed by *Christ Jesus* were intended, and included in them." If I

have not got the clue, then be so good as to help me to it. It is not in the power of any man to oblige another more, than hereby you will me, who am, with truth and esteem,

Reverend Sir,

your very faithful,

humble servant,

BARRINGTON.

Dr. Lardner to Lord Barrington.

August 20th, 1728.

My Lord,—I am very much indebted to your Lordship for the honour of your very kind letter, and have great reason to set a very high value on your opinion of my performance. But surely your Lordship has read me not only with candour, which you shew upon all occasions, but with favour; your Lordship's just zeal for the cause which I have proposed to serve has not only approved the design, but likewise favoured the execution. I am, however, extremely happy that my endeavours have not been unacceptable to a person of your Lordship's merit and distinction, who so well understands the true nature of Christianity, and the best manner of defending it.

I return your Lordship my most humble thanks for those remarks you have bestowed upon the 'Credibility.' I am very desirous to concur entirely with your Lordship's sentiments, and have therefore deferred, longer than I ought

to have done, my acknowledgments of your favour: and your Lordship will perceive I have taken those matters into fresh consideration.

SECTION I.—*The silence of Josephus respecting the slaughter of the innocents not to be regarded.*

I was so intent upon the authors near the rise of Christianity, that I had like not to have put down Macrobius' passage at all, because it is so late. I the less regarded it, because the objection relating to the slaughter of the infants, taken from the silence of Josephus, appeared to me of no moment. When we have but one history of the affairs of a country, and that history a brief one, the omission of some particular event is no difficulty; and all that the author of the scheme has said to make it one, in my opinion, deserves nothing but contempt. Besides, as Josephus was a firm Jew, there was a particular reason for his passing over this event, because he could not mention it without giving the Christian cause a very great advantage. To write that Herod, at the latter end of his reign, had put to death all the infants at Bethlehem under two years of age, on occasion of a report spread, that the King of the Jews had been lately born there, would have greatly gratified the Christians, whom Josephus hated, since it

was well known, when he wrote, that about thirty years after the slaughter, and the latter end of Herod's reign, Jesus (who was said to be born at Bethlehem), being then about thirty years of age, styled Himself the King of the Jews, and did many things, to say no more in proof of it. I have hinted this, and thought I should have been understood from what I said of Josephus, Credib. vol. 2. p. 80. 86, and 196; but did not care to speak more expressly, till I shew that the testimony concerning our Saviour, found in Josephus' works, is not genuine, which I hope to do hereafter.

SECTION II.—*Character of Macrobius and Aulus Gellius.*

Macrobius appears to me a blind and bigotted heathen. I did not know that any one supposed him a Christian. Nor did the author of the scheme think he was; and his putting in such a hint was unjust and unfair. Your Lordship has, *en passant,* called Macrobius an historian; but I believe your Lordship does not intend the strictest sense of the word. I have upon this occasion looked into the index of Vossius' book, 'De Historicis Latinis,' and I do not find there the name of Macrobius, nor of Aulus Gellius, whose Fur and Simia the witty Tanaquil Faber says Macrobius was. Aulus Gellius,

I think, was a Latin grammarian, who lived at Athens. And Vossius' not inserting an account of either of those authors in that treatise, is an argument he thought the nature of their works did not entitle them to the character of historians. Nor does Macrobius seem to be well acquainted with history: witness his blunder about the Plinys, lib. xi. c. 12; a thing that lay in his own way as a Roman critic, in which study he seems to have employed his leisure hours, when at liberty from his family concerns and public employments, though it may be esteemed some apology for him, that St. Jerome and some other authors have also confounded the two Plinys: vide Scaliger, Animadv. Euseb. I think it is not a natural interpretation of Macrobius' words that Augustus having heard, that *about the time* that Herod commanded the children to be put to death, his own son was killed, &c. And who would put a forced construction upon a passage writ four hundred years after an event? Besides, I do not think that Antipater's death happened about that time. It seems to me very probable, that the infants were slaughtered some considerable time before Antipater's death, and that he was then in high favour with Herod, and had a hand in that slaughter, and increased the cruelty of it.

SECTION III.—*Remarks upon Augustus' jest upon Herod, and the occasion of it.*

I make no doubt but Macrobius has given us exactly the words and terms of Augustus' jest. The question is, what was the occasion of the jest?

I will put down the several events which might give occasion to that jest upon Herod. 1. The death of Alexander and Aristobulus. If Herod had then put to death but *one* son, and that upon just cause, I should not reckon this a very likely occasion of the jest, it being the first instance of Herod's executing a child of his. But since he then put to death *two* sons, it is one very likely ground of the jest, especially considering their enemies were not so great as some are. 2. When Herod first wrote to Augustus for leave to put Antipater to death, and there were not the strongest proofs of his crime. This is another very likely occasion, since Herod had before executed two sons. 3. Antipater's death, provided Augustus heard of it before Herod was dead. For if Herod was dead when Augustus heard of Antipater's death, he could not have said in the present tense, "It is better to be Herod's hog than his son;" but must have spoke in the time past. Now, though it is possible that Augustus might hear of Antipater's being executed before he heard of Herod's

death, and thereforeit is possible he might pass that jest upon occasion of the execution of Antipater; yet it is highly improbable; first, because it is most likely the news of Herod's death would be brought him as soon as that of Antipater; Herod's death being the more important event, and having happened five days after Antipater's. Secondly, because Antipater was the worst of men, and Augustus knew it. He had put to death at Rome a Jewish woman for being an accomplice with him; so great and notorious was Antipater's crime. These reasons render it somewhat improbable that Augustus should thus joke upon Herod on occasion of Antipater's death. 4. If there had been any young child, or even grandchild of Herod, under two years of age, put to death among the children at Bethlehem, this might have been another occasion. But such a supposition would be little better than a fiction, since there is nothing plainly said of it in antiquity.

Baronius did (A. 1. p. 50) from this passage of Macrobius infer that a young child of Herod was slain with the infants.[1] But there is no other ground for this supposition, except that

[1] But I do not know that any one else has thought that Macrobius' passage, writ at the end of the fourteenth century, could justify such a supposition, when none of the Christian writers have said any thing of it.

passage of Josephus I have alleged, v. 2. p. 71, 72, where the words which I have translated, *every one of his own family*, might possibly be understood of relations, because οἰκεῖοι is sometimes so used. And as Antipater seems then to have been in high favour, and was making his efforts for the succession, it might be conjectured, that if there was then any young child and descendant of Herod, he might get it despatched with the rest. But it would still be a groundless conjecture.[1]

It is unlikely that a child of Herod's descendants should be born at Bethlehem; but very improbable that any child of his own should be born any where but in his own palace. Besides, Josephus speaks of none killed but those who stood with the Pharisees, which cannot be said of a young child, but only of grown people. Moreover, if any young child of Herod himself had been slain, Josephus, notwithstanding his great reservedness about that execution, could not have omitted it. And if any young child of Herod's relations had been killed, one would think it should have been a child of Pheroas. And if it had, Josephus could not have omitted it, having said so

[1] It would have been a most daring attempt in Antipater, since Herod himself did not venture to put to death any of his sons without leave first obtained from Augustus.

much of him; nor would he, as may be concluded from the part Josephus takes in that narration. There is therefore no sufficient ground for that supposition. I do not mention, as an occasion, Antipater's death heard after, or together with, the news of Herod's death; because I have shewn that these words could not be spoken by Augustus at that time.

There were therefore two very likely occasions of this jest; namely, the death of Aristobulus and Alexander, and Herod's letter for leave to put Antipater to death, when his crimes were not fully proved; and one more occasion possible, the death of Antipater, if known by Augustus before he heard of Herod's death. It seems to me therefore highly probable, that Macrobius was mistaken about the occasion of the jest; and that the jest has no relation to the infants. He met with the jest, and invented the occasion. It is easy to suppose Macrobius knew nothing of Herod's history from ancient writers. It is even likely from this passage, he had never heard of the executions of Aristobulus and Alexander, or of Antipater. The jest then he had from some author, the occasion he collected from the common report at that time among the Christians, who often spoke of Herod's murder of the infants in Judea.

Or, if Macrobius had this whole passage (the jest and the occasion of it) from some author,

the same ignorance must be imputed to his author in common with himself.

SECTION IV.—*The allusion of Macrobius shews that the slaughter of the infants was well known in his time.*

Upon the whole, then, all the use that can be made of this passage is, that the slaughter of the infants in Judea by Herod was a thing well known in Macrobius' time, and not contested by heathens. And this use I shall be willing to make of it hereafter if I have opportunity; as also any farther use of it, if I should be convinced there is reason, as I am very willing to be. And indeed if there were ground to suppose the whole passage (and not only the jest) was taken from some ancienter author, it would be a proof that the slaughter was known in that author's time also. But who this author was, or when he lived, is altogether uncertain. This, however, is most likely; he was not a Christian, because Macrobius probably did not much use such authors. Another thing concerning him is also pretty evident, namely, he did not know Herod's history.

SECTION V.—*Dr. Lardner's opinion that St. Peter's Epistles were inscribed to the Jews, but intended for the Gentiles also.*

What led me to think Peter's Epistles were writ to Jews is that part of the title or inscription of the first epistle, *scattered,* compared with the inscription of James, "The twelve tribes which are *scattered abroad,*" which must, I suppose, be understood of Jews, and because Josephus uses this phrase, Contr. Ap. l. 1. and 7. Hudson καὶ εἶπου τῆς ἄλλης οἰκουμένης τοῦ γένους τῶν ἱερέων εἰσι τίνες διεσπαρμένοι. I own that this was the chief reason I had. But then if the διασπορὰ, John vii. 35, be understood of the Gentiles, as many think it must, this will very much weaken my argument. Though I think even then διασπορὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων may mean the Jews: and the sense of that place will be this: will he go to the Jews scattered among the Gentiles, and, being got among them, teach the Gentiles? If this be the true sense of that place, then all the instances we have of the use of διασπορὰ will be understood of Jews. There is, however, another particular in the inscription of St. Peter's first epistle, which favours my reason, namely, *strangers.* Can the Gentiles that are at home be called strangers? If we interpret the word in a religious sense, as good men are strangers in

this world, it seems low and whimsical. If it be really so, I am sure it is unworthy of the apostles, and unsuitable to the rest of their style. There is also this to be said for my opinion, that it seems not agreeable to Peter's character to send an epistle to Gentiles (if there were any Jews Christians in those parts) without particularly mentioning the Jews. His epistle therefore might be inscribed to the Jews, but intended also for the Gentiles: and this way will pretty well account for those expressions in his epistles that seem to relate peculiarly to Gentiles. Though the letter was inscribed to Jews, the believing Gentiles would yet be very willing to pay a due respect to it. But if it had been directed to Gentiles, the Jews might have disregarded it. Moreover, as I understand that text a *more sure word of prophecy*, of Old Testament prophecies, and not of the prophecies, or any particular prophecy of the New Testament, that part of the epistle seems more especially addressed to the Jews. Only, by the way, I should translate those words, *a very sure word;* not *more sure;* much after the same manner that Mr. Rowe has done. I have represented my reasons for supposing St. Peter's epistles addressed to the Jews; but I am far from being positive of the goodness of them, and they are humbly submitted to your Lordship's better

judgment, as is also what I have here offered concerning Macrobius' testimony.

I am, my Lord,

your Lordship's most humble,

most obedient servant,

N. L.

August 20th, 1728.

Lord Barrington to Dr. Lardner.

Becket House, June 23d, 1729.

Rev. Sir,—Nothing could be more acceptable to me, than the frankness with which you urge further difficulties against my opinion, in yours of the 6th March.[1] Without frankness in objecting, and candour in weighing what is objected, no correspondence on any subject can be agreeable or useful, what other talents or good qualities soever may be employed in it. These indeed are a great felicity to those who possess them, and raise our admiration and esteem wherever we meet with them; but the others are what we indispensably owe to such as we choose to converse with: and being in our own power, can never be wanting without exposing us to censure. I therefore promise you, as I ought, that you shall meet with these in every page: and I promise this the rather, since I am in hopes that candour and frankness on my part, like charity, to which they belong, will cover a multitude of faults.

[1] The letter here referred to cannot be found.

SECTION I.—*Necessity and advantage of studying the Old Testament critically.*

I agree in general with what you say about curiosity. But, in pursuance of the freedom I have just now promised you, I must add, that I do not see how what you say against curiosity is more applicable to critical inquiries into the meaning of the Old Testament, than it would be to inquiries into the critical meaning of any other ancient book; which yet I think has never been censured as needless curiosity; since we can never understand the precise and full meaning of any author, without understanding him critically, (i. e. without understanding him according to the rules of language and context,) much less discern the beauties and elegancies of his performance. And shall not the Old Testament have the preference of all other ancient books? Its matter is of infinitely greater weight; its authority is more undoubted; the information it gives us can be had no other way; the references to it in the New Testament are very numerous (all of them, except in the gospel of *St. Luke*, and *the Acts*, having been written by Jews, and many of them addressed to people of that nation). The whole design of all God's providences with the children of men, from the creation, centres in the dispensation of God to mankind in Christ Jesus: and without

a regard to those several dispensations, the scheme of the Christian religion can never be fully understood, or fully proved and vindicated against all its adversaries. These are all of them so many considerations, which give the preference to the critical study of the Old Testament infinitely before any other book of antiquity; and does not only free us from the charge of curiosity, when we study it, but renders men of learning and leisure exposed to a charge of a contrary nature if they neglect it. Men can never have a just value for a book, how invaluable soever in itself, which they do not understand. It is well, in case they happen to understand it, if they do not fall into a contempt of it: and if men once come to have a contempt for the Old Testament they will not easily be brought to have a just respect for the New; especially when they consider the regard which the Author of our religion always paid to *Moses* and the *prophets* whenever they came in His way. And I cannot but think it is the want of understanding the *Old Testament* critically which makes so many skeptics about revelation as we daily meet with. The New Testament has had great pains bestowed on it, and a great deal of new light cast on several parts of it; but the Old Testament has not been cultivated with proportionable care: yet the *Deists* will be apt to say to us, "What signifies removing the diffi-

culties, that are objected to the New Testament, if you cannot remove those which occur in the books which are previous to the New Testament, and which are so often quoted and referred to, as Scripture, in them?" I am heartily sorry more pains has not been bestowed on the Old Testament, because I am of opinion that a fruitful harvest of useful knowledge offers itself there to every friend of revelation who will be but at the pains to reap it. In this I had the honour of my Lord Chancellor *King's* concurring with me, in a conversation I had the happiness to have with him on this subject, a little before the *Essay on God's Dispensation to Mankind* was published.

SECTION II.—*Great importance of the Book of Genesis.*

Whilst I am on this head, I must also take the liberty to say that I think the book of *Genesis* preferable to all the other books of the Old Testament, as it gives us the fullest proof, from the clearest and earliest tradition, that the world is not eternal; that it was created by God about six thousand years ago; that our first parents were created at the same time; that they were designed for immortality; that death entered by sin; that the first man who was remarkable for walking with God (after *Adam*

had first run away from Him) was visibly repossessed of immortality by translation; that men presently conceived hopes of this immortal inheritance, calling themselves "sons of God;" that *Abraham*, (in all likelihood the only one of his age free from idolatry,) a descendant of the seed which God gave *Eve* instead of righteous Abel, viz. Seth, by *righteous Noah* and blessed *Shem*, &c. was promised an everlasting possession of *Canaan*, and, by the strongest and most obvious implication, was promised it through a resurrection from the dead; if, instead of apostatizing to idolatry and vice, he would continue to walk before God and be perfect; and was further promised, that this grant should endure to all persons of every family, even of the most accursed, that should imitate his pious example.

If inquiries into the critical meaning of the Old Testament be the thing you intend, when you say, that you are discouraged in the pursuit of speculations in religious matters, on observing that our *Saviour* and His *Apostles* do not enter into many particulars of the "future life," allow me to express some surprise at it, when you know, Sir, that our *Saviour* bids the *Jews search the Scriptures*, (viz. of the Old Testament,) *as that wherein they thought* (and to be sure justly, or else He could not have enjoined that search) *they had eternal life;*—when the only argument He uses to prove a future life or a

resurrrection (which in Scripture differs but as the door and the house) is fetched from a passage in *Moses'* history, and which, without a critical understanding of the Old Testament, will never appear to us to be an argument that is conclusive against the persons whom it was brought to convince, or at least to silence; and, to add no more, when our *Saviour*, His *historians*; and *apostles*, abound every where with references to it, and citations and proofs from it.

I must likewise take liberty to say, that I cannot but be the more surprised at your saying this, if I take your meaning in it aright; when the great objection made against Christianity in our days, by every artful adversary of it, is, "that the quotations made from the *Old Testament*, by the writers of the *New*, are not to be met with in the *Old Testament*, or are not pertinent to the purpose for which they are brought." The only answer, sure, to this objection, is only to be fetched from a critical study of the books of the *Old Testament* as well as of the *New*. It is very true, "all critical inquiries are subject to some uncertainty:" they can otherwise never rise higher than probabilities. But we must make the best of them we can. Notwithstanding they are but probable, there is great use to be made of them; and we are answerable for it, if we do not act up to the degree of probability we can arrive at by our critical inquiries

about them. Whatever objection therefore you can urge from this topic against the critical study of the *Old Testament*, will hold in a proportionable degree against the study of the *New;* where nothing, now at least, is to be done (as you let me see you are well aware) without more or less critical skill: I say this, notwithstanding that I apprehend with you, that the *Gospels* and the *Acts* were plain books when they were writ: but so, as I apprehend, was *Genesis* also. What is necessary for salvation is still plain. Let that satisfy the busy and active part of mankind. The scheme of God's dispensations is difficult. Here is employment for those of greater leisure and contemplation.

After saying thus much in general, I will make my observations on the several particulars of your letter, in the order in which they lie in it.

SECTION III.—*On Adam's nakedness before the fall.*

I agree with you that Adam was created naked, and that he was naked after his fall. But we must suppose he had a garment or covering between these two periods; or else, why was it said, that, after he had eaten of the forbidden fruit, his and his wife's eyes were opened, *and they saw that they were naked;* that is, destitute of the garment that had covered

them, which, as I apprehend, was the badge of all their dignity and felicity? God had shewn them the tree of knowledge of good and evil, and told them that in the day they eat of it *they should surely die.* The serpent had told them, that if they would but eat of it, *their eyes would be opened, and they should be as God, knowing good and evil;* i. e. knowing good and evil, so as to be indefeasibly possessed of the one, and inviolably secured against the other; particularly against death, which had been threatened, an evil that must for ever deprive them of all good. So God knows good and evil; but, says Moses, "when they had eaten the forbidden fruit, so far was this vain, delusory, and presumptuous promise of the devil from being made good to them, and so fully was God's threatening verified, that their eyes were only opened (beyond what they had been before) to see the evil and misery they had brought upon themselves, stript of the Godlike robe which covered them, which he expresses by their *seeing themselves naked;* a nakedness that what they girt about their loins could by no means hide. For to this purpose it is, that when God asked *Adam, where he was?* he says in answer, *I hid myself, because I was naked;* as naked, (in Moses' sense of nakedness,) after they had made themselves aprons, as before, v. 7. 10. He farther says, that *he was* AFRAID. That it was a garment of dignity, (a badge of

his dominion, bliss and immortality,) seems also to be plainly implied in this, that his fear proceeded from his nakedness; or, from finding himself stript of this garment; otherwise I cannot conceive how his nakedness should make him afraid. On the supposition that it was a garment of dignity, (a badge of his filial relation to God,) it is obvious how his being stript of it made him afraid; for he then must needs see that God was not his Father, nor he His son; since he was stript of the badge of that relation. Moreover, is not this implied in God's reply? which I apprehend amounts to this: *How camest thou to be naked? Hast thou eaten of the forbidden tree?* Does not this imply, that God had told him, when He gave him that prohibition, or when He gave him that garment, that if he broke through that prohibition, he should be stript of that garment? Thus I consider this matter, who have ever thought the third of Genesis a history. And if a glory be, or is to be, the garment of all God's sons, either by creation, adoption, or generation, as it certainly is, it seems most probable that Adam's garment or covering before the fall was also a glory, he being then a son of God. Supposing *form of God* (Phil. ii. 6) to signify the glory which the Word had before His incarnation, (a badge of His high dignity and power, or of His future heirship,) and *form of a slave* to signify flesh with-

out a glory, (the badge of sonship or heirship,) and all the text is easy: particularly the words that follow: BEING MADE *in the likeness of man* (as it should be rendered): without it, all is disturbed. This therefore is, in my opinion, a good reason to go into this interpretation. Give me at least your difficulties against this supposition; or, if you please, an interpretation of that text that may be as free from objection. *If sinful flesh* (Rom. viii. 3) means nothing but man, or flesh, the word *sinful* has no emphasis, but is entirely superfluous and redundant. Whereas, in my way of interpreting *sinful*, there is a great force and beauty in that epithet's being added to *flesh*. The sense of the place then will be, "There is no condemnation therefore [to the second death] to those who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit [the Author of eternal life]; who by His [revelation] law has made us free from the law [of Moses], which was a law of sin and death." For when the law [of Moses] could not give us life, by reason it was too weak to subdue our sinful flesh, God sending His own Son in the likeness of that sinful flesh, i. e. of flesh which, through sin, was first deprived of its glory (the badge of immortality, &c.), by making Him (in that mortal body which He took) a sacrifice for sin, condemned sin in the flesh.

I agree, that ST. LUKE's immediate meaning,

when he says (chap. iii. v. ult.) that *Adam was the son of God*, is, "that whilst others had an earthly parent, *Adam* was immediately created by God:" so immediately at least, as to have no other father but God. But the being created immediately by God in the circumstances in which *Moses'* history informed *St. Luke* that *Adam* was created, implies that he was *a son of God* in all that extended sense and meaning of the word which I have given it.

You say, "that *Moses* speaks nothing of God's creating *Adam* in his moral perfections." But can any thing come out of the hand of God but what is perfect, spotless, and innocent? If *Adam* had not been so, would it have been consistent with wisdom and justice for God to have given him dominion, to have placed him in Eden, and to have shewn him the tree of life, in order to preserve his earthly frame to immortality? and as a badge of all this, to give him a glory for a covering? These high favours, in all cases, ever suppose a resemblance of God in His moral perfections, and must therefore suppose it in *Adam*. Otherwise we take away all reason of God's treating one being as a son, and another as a servant or slave.

SECTION IV.—*On the sense in which Adam is said to have begotten Seth "in his own likeness."*

If Moses meant no more by saying that "*Adam begat Seth in his own likeness*" besides telling us, "that *Adam* begat a perfect man, though a little one," why, I pray you, does not he say the same thing on the birth of *Cain,* his first-born (or even of righteous Abel)? the only proper place for such a thought as you suppose *Moses* to express by these words. Do you suppose, Sir, that by adding these words on the occasion of *Adam's* begetting *Seth,* when he omitted them in acquainting us that he begat *Cain* [and Abel], Moses intended to tell us, that *Adam* did not beget Cain [and Abel] a perfect man, but mutilated in some parts of his body? That is what I should be led to think *Moses* designed, by not adding these words, when *Cain* [and Abel] was born, since he adds them when *Seth* was born, if I understand them as you do; or else I must think *Moses* a very bad writer, who appears to me to be a very accurate one. But what occasion was there for *Moses* to add these words at all, if your sense is their true meaning? God had blessed our first parents, and bid them *be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth.* Did *Moses* then only intend to tell us that when *Adam* begat *Seth, he begat after his kind? Moses* tells us that God gave

alike blessing to the fowls and the fish, the beasts and the cattle. But yet he does not think it worth his while to inform us that they actually multiplied after their kind. He supposes, after informing us that God blessed [or promised to bless] them in this manner, that his reader would take it for granted that they were actually blessed accordingly: and why would he not suppose his reader would take it for granted in the case of *Adam's* begetting *Seth*, as well as in the case of *Adam's* begetting *Cain* [and *Abel*]; and in the case of the multiplication of animals after their several kinds?

SECTION V.—*The mode of reasoning employed by lawyers more suitable to theology than that of philosophers or schoolmen.*

God has ever treated with that part of mankind that He has been pleased to reveal His will to, under the notion of a father, or of a king, or of both. The relations between a father and son and a king and his subjects are law notions, and are best learned from the *lawyers*. *Philosophers*, *schoolmen*, and others, do not talk of these with the accuracy that *lawyers* do. *Lawyers* being used to debate with one another, and before able *judges*, and about matters in life, makes them generally, in my opinion, closer and clearer reasoners, than any other

body of men. They cannot so easily talk nonsense or wander in matters of life, as on other subjects. But if they do, they are presently called back to their point; which other pleaders, writers, or haranguers, are not. From hence it is that there are fewer differences in opinion among able men of that profession than any other. What they call *pleadings*, are the most exact draughts in the world; because their whole strength and beauty lies, in not using one word unnecessarily, or in using any that has an indeterminate signification. Either of these might be a flaw in the pleading, and vitiate the plea. And as *divines* are but the interpreters of the sacred *code* concerning notions (as applied to God and man) that the *lawyers* but explain; and as the *lawyers* are the best body of reasoners among *us* (as they also were so among the *Romans*), I think their way of reasoning is more suited to a true *divine*, than the reasonings of *philosophers* or *schoolmen*, or systematical and polemical *theologues*.

SECTION VI.—*The interpretations of the Jewish lawyers necessarily vicious.*

But it is not a wonder, if the *Jewish lawyers* corrupted the Testament, since they did not interpret it by itself; but by oral traditions: and that their reasonings were not appeals to a

judge, about matters of life; but addresses to the superstition of the people, about another life; entirely consisting in the recommendation of things to the people, much more profitable to themselves, and much less difficult to the people, than the love of God and their neighbour.

SECTION VII.—*On the meaning of the expressions,* "*sons of God,*" *and* "*sons of men.*"

I cannot be of opinion, that when *Moses* "calls the children of *Seth* sons of God, he only means worshippers of God." Language will not admit it, that the sons of God should *only* signify *worshippers of God.* The natural idea that *sons of God* carries in it, is obedience and submission to God, resignation to His will, from a trust placed in Him; and an expectation of an inheritance from Him. Nor can I see by what rule of language, "sons of man" can signify "men of the world," or "men that pursue the world." Sons of men signify men that are mere sons of men, and have no other father: that is, are not made the adopted sons of God. And we may well suppose, that this was the original signification of these terms in the fifth or sixth generation from *Adam:* the original use of words being always according to their natural import; though in a long tract of time, and by

accidents, we sometimes find the natural import of words and expressions laid aside, and a cant use of them taken up, understood only by small communities and societies of men. Savouring or relishing the things of God, and the "things of men," are expressions that keep their native signification, but will not help to show that sons of God stand in *Genesis* for worshippers of God: or that sons of men stand for those that only mind worldly things, or the things that are generally pursued by men.

SECTION VIII.—*Probable reasons from observation and Scripture that the soul is unconscious in a separate state.*

I am glad that "what I have offered against the separate state of rewards and punishments appears so highly plausible to you;" because I think it tends to support and explain revelation in a degree far beyond what we can imagine, till we consider it very attentively. But you have some difficulties remaining. You ask, "since in my opinion souls subsist in *hades*, why they may not have thought and perception?" My answer, Sir, is, because I think it appears from observation and Scripture, that God has designed them to act in an united state, and not in a separate state. If I am to speak my mind freely, I think that, which was in our *Saviour*,

what a soul is in us, was unconscious in its separate state, as I apprehend our souls are: or else, I think our *Saviour* could not be said to have tasted of death, if death be to us a state of unconsciousness.

SECTION IX.—*On the sense of the words of our Lord to the penitent thief.*

Our version renders our *Saviour's* saying to the thief, thus: *Verily verily I say unto thee, this day shalt thou be with me in paradise.* This is the only text on which the opinion is built of Christ's going to paradise during His separate state. But *St. Peter* supposes His soul went to *hades,* and that it was brought from thence at his resurrection (Acts ii. 31); and so you know the apostles' creed runs [dead and buried] [*He descended* into *hades*]; yet hades in Scripture does not signify *paradise.* For every soul goes to *hades* (Psalm lxxxix. 48); but every soul does not go to *paradise,* to be entertained as St. Paul was, when he was wrapt up into it (2 Cor. xii. 4). Why then may not this text be translated thus? *Verily verily* I THIS DAY [or now] *say unto thee, thou shalt be with me in paradise:* viz. at the resurrection: as soon as thou beginnest to be conscious again. And I say this to thee, THIS DAY, notwithstanding it is the day of my weakness, and the *hour* and *power* of darkness.

We see σήμερον used for *now* (Matt. xxi. 28. Acts iv. 9). This was a sufficient answer to the prayer of the *thief:* viz. *Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom!* Yes, says our Saviour, I now assure thee, that when I come into my kingdom, viz. that high and exalted state of it, which is alone called my kingdom by *Daniel* (Dan. vii. 9—14), and is that state of my kingdom, *when the stone cut out of the mountain shall fill the whole earth,* (which *Mr. Joseph Mede* justly calls *regnum montis,*) then thou shalt be with me in *paradise;* or in the paradisaical state of my kingdom upon earth.

SECTION X.—*On the only inference that can be legitimately drawn from the parable of Dives and Lazarus.*

I think nothing is to be proved from *parables,* but the moral of them: the rest is to be considered but as embellishment. All therefore that I should apprehend from the parable of *Dives and Lazarus,* is, that the cause why men do not believe, is from wicked prejudice, and not from want of evidence; or that supposed greater evidence would not have the force with wicked men that we are apt to imagine it would. I cannot think that body or matter, that is, something purely passive, can add any thing to a soul that is purely an active and conscious

principle, and supposed to be capable of thought and enjoyment in a separate state. If it could, I do not see how it could be the highest perfection to be pure spirit, as God undoubtedly is.

SECTION XI.—*The promise of eternal life to Abraham to be fulfilled in Canaan.*

If it be true, that God promised *Abraham* an everlasting possession of *Canaan* after death, I dare say it has its good consequences; because no truth is without good consequences, whether we see those good consequences or no. But I flatter myself I now see several good consequences flowing from that assertion. It makes this revelation in itself the more probable, inasmuch as it is evidently suited to the state of things at the time it was made. It supports those assertions of the New Testament, that eternal life was promised before the Jewish state commenced; or, which comes to the same thing, that it was promised to *Abraham:* I will not mention the places here; give me leave to refer you to the last paragraph of my letter for them. But where are the fathers promised to enjoy eternal life? In heaven? We have not a word of going to heaven in all the Old Testament, much less in *Genesis* or *Exodus;* as we must, if God promised eternal life in heaven before the Jewish state. Is it not of consequence

then to find everlasting life promised to *Abraham* in an everlasting possession of *Canaan?* Another good consequence of seeing that God promised Abraham the everlasting possession of *Canaan* is, that it shows the great beauty and proportion of those discoveries of our future happiness which God has made. When *Adam* had just lost Eden, and was debarred from it, good men had hope of being readmitted to it after death; as it is probable they thought *Enoch* was, when God took him; as I have offered something to prove in my first letter. The glory called an angel, with a flaming sword, which I apprehend was the Shechinah (Gen. iii.), was placed at the entrance of *Eden* immediately after the fall. That seems to have been considered as the fall, and presence of God (Gen. iv. 14. 16); and thither it is probable the first men directed their worship, praying to be readmitted to that happy mansion. And from thence probably came the ancient worship of fire. When good men were to multiply greatly, and from a family to become, not only a nation, but a multitude of nations, God promises that *Canaan*, a whole country, should be *Eden;* and expressly gives it to *Abraham* and his pious imitators for an everlasting possession [after death].

SECTION XII.—*The enjoyment of heaven not expressly promised till after the ascension of our Lord.*

But Christ is come from *heaven*, to show us the way thither, and to assure us, that at the end of this long, this one thousand years' possession of *Canaan*, we shall be carried to *heaven;* whence He came, and whither He is gone, *to prepare a place for us, that where He is there we may be also.* Our Saviour gives us distant hints of this when He says, *The meek shall inherit the earth;* and when He says, *That we shall sit down, and eat and drink with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of God;* and that they who have lost possessions for Christ's sake, shall in this time receive an *hundred fold;* and in the time *to come, life everlasting.* But the fuller opening of these things was left, in great wisdom, as many others were, to *St. Paul, St. Peter*, and *St. John*, who might make these discoveries, after the spiritual nature of our Saviour's kingdom was fully understood, and established as a principle among Christians, with less hazard than our Saviour could have done in His own time, when these discoveries might have been abused, through the more carnal notions that were so fixed in the minds of the apostles and first disciples, concerning the immediate ap-

pearance of the temporal kingdom of our Lord, in the then state of things in the world.

SECTION XIII.—*The everlasting possession of Canaan is to be understood of a residence there for a thousand years; after which, Abraham and his spiritual seed are to be advanced to the enjoyment of heaven.*

I confess I thought I had fully proved in mine of the 18th *December*, that God had promised *Abraham* an everlasting possession of *Canaan* after death. I have nothing material to add to it. But I will endeavour to answer your objections, which I find keep you in some hesitation about this matter; though you do not show me any flaw in my proof. You ask, "why, if God designed that *Abraham* should possess this land in person afterwards, He did not say expressly, You shall be also revived and raised up hereafter, to live here yourself in person?" If God designed *Abraham* a future possession of the land of *Canaan*, it must be in person; for possession is a personal thing; and the possession of *Abraham's* seed could not possibly in any sense be *Abraham's* possession. *Abraham's* possession and inheritance, is the possession and inheritance of his seed, because it *endures* to them; and his possession strengthens their title: but their inheritance or possession cannot

in any sense possibly be his. For their inheritance does not endure to him, nor their possession strengthen his title or possession. Thus therefore it appears that God's promise to raise up *Abraham* was sufficiently plain. And must not *Abraham,* and we, understand what God says, when He speaks plainly, only because He might have spoken more plainly; that is, because He might have expressed what is fully implied; and have said, You *shall revive and be raised up,* in order to take this everlasting possession?

I make this difference between an *inheritance* to Abraham and *his seed* FOR EVER, and *Abraham's everlasting possession.* The difference between these two does not lie in *for ever* and *everlasting,* as I think you imagine it does. And I agree with you that *everlasting* signifies only a long duration, or the longest duration of its kind; but not a duration without end. The instances you give of this sense of the word *everlasting* are irrefragable, and therefore when *Abraham* is promised an everlasting possession of *Canaan,* I do not suppose that he is to live there for ever. No, Sir, I suppose that, after the resurrection, and a thousand years' enjoyment of the heavenly *Jerusalem* in the land of Canaan, he will be taken up to the third *heavens,* where Christ is, and where the good *angels* and all good *men* shall be also. I suppose therefore

that *Canaan* is promised to *Abraham*, as an everlasting possession; because it will not only be for so long a term as a thousand years, but because it will be the last possession on this earth.

SECTION XIV.—*On the difference between "an everlasting possession" and "an inheritance for ever."*

But the difference I have just now mentioned lies, with me, between AN INHERITANCE FOR EVER, and an EVERLASTING POSSESSION. I have an inheritance in this county to me and my heirs for ever; because it will go to my heirs to the world's end, if something be not done to alter it. But sure I have not an everlasting possession, unless my personal continuance here was to be everlasting; possession being something personal. I may also have the grant of an inheritance to me and my heirs *for ever* after another, of which I have no possession, much less an everlasting possession. This may serve to show the difference between giving the land to *Abraham* and his seed for ever, and giving him an everlasting possession of it.

For this reason, whatever be meant by giving the land for an everlasting possession *to thee, and thy seed after thee*, Gen. xvii. 8, it cannot be giving the everlasting possession of it to him in

or by his seed: language will not bear this. For possession is personal; and the possession of *Abraham's* seed cannot be called *Abraham's* possession. Nor can their inheritance be called his; though his possession and his inheritance may be called theirs. *After*, therefore, does not refer to *give;* as if the meaning was, I will give the everlasting possession of *Canaan* to thy seed, after I have given the everlasting possession of it to thee. That has not been the case; for *Abraham* has as yet had no possession of it; but *after* is to be referred to seed; as much as to say, I will give it not only to thee, but to thy seed, which shall be after thee: parents, whether natural or spiritual, being before their natural or spiritual seed. And I apprehend Gen. xlviii. 4 is the same covenant renewed with *Jacob* that God first entered into with *Abraham*, Gen. xvii. 8; for the everlasting possession of Canaan is to be given to all true *Israelites*.

SECTION XV.—*On the true nature of that covenant of which circumcision was the seal.*

"Circumcision was not given as a condition of Abraham's and his spiritual seed's having the everlasting possession of *Canaan;*" because it was enjoined *to all his seed in all their generations;* consequently to *Ishmael* and his seed, as well as to *Isaac* and his *seed;* notwithstanding

that God told Abraham at that time, that He would not establish his everlasting covenant (or the covenant of the everlasting possession) with *Ishmael,* but with *Isaac.* On the other hand, every servant born in *Abraham's* house, and bought with his money, was to be circumcised, ver. 12, 13; but nobody else: no stranger; not even an hired *servant:* so that whatever was the full intent of circumcision, we see it was a family badge, or a token in the flesh of every male part of *Abraham's* family, and the succeeding families of his seed (especially whilst God's family should be in a manner confined to *Abraham's*); but not in the flesh of any one that was a stranger to *Abraham's* family, or that was but a fluctuating and unsettled part of it. Circumcision is to be considered as a sign and a seal of God's performing that promise to *Abraham* and all his spiritual seed, which *Abraham's* righteousness in some sort called for, and entitled him to, and was the condition of, Rom. iv. 11. The promise, however, would endure to his spiritual seed, though they were uncircumcised, if they walked before God, and were perfect, as he was (the sole condition of this promise); the promise being made to *Abraham* in uncircumcision, as *St. Paul* observes, Rom. iv. 10—13. And circumcision, though a badge or token peculiar to ABRAHAM's family only; yet it would serve as a sign and seal of the truth of

God's promise to all Abraham's spiritual seed, of whatever other family and nation they were, to whom this rite of Abraham's family should be known. And the *one seed* being now come, which consists not only of the believers of *Abraham's* family, but of the believers of every other family and nation, without distinction of *Jew or Gentile, bond or free, male or female,* now that God's family is no longer confined to ABRAHAM'S, we have all, by being *baptized into Christ Jesus, and having put Him on* (as the new clothes after baptism), Gal. iii. 27, 28; we have all, I say, a sign and token, that, if we die unto sin, and are raised unto newness of life, we shall be raised again from the dead; and after possessing the paradisaical *Canaan* as *Abraham's seed,* by virtue of the promise made to *Abraham,* Gal. iii. 29, we shall, in bodies like to our blessed Lord's, *ascend to His Father, and our Father, to His God, and our God,* and be for ever with the Lord.

"The difference between what is promised to *Isaac* and what is promised to *Ishmael,* does not seem to lie in a greater degree of temporal felicity promised to *Isaac* than to *Ishmael;*" but singly in this: that the covenant or promise made to *Isaac,* was an everlasting covenant or promise; (that is, the covenant or promise of an everlasting possession of *Canaan;*) whereas the promise to *Ishmael* was not the promise of an

everlasting possession, though indeed of great temporal felicity.

SECTION XVI.—*On the gradual developement of revelation.*

When I said that God's revelations are like a "shining light," &c. I only meant it of such revelations as have a thread or connexion; such as these to *Abraham* appear to be. Take the assertion, as relating to such as these, and I believe it will hold. But I did not mean it of occasional revelations: such as that to *Paul*, Acts xxiii. 11; yet even that revelation was in some sort progressive; for whereas it is probable that in former revelations *Paul* had been ordered to go to *Syria*, *Asia*, *Macedonia*, *Greece*, and *Illyricum*, he is now ordered to go as far as *Rome*, the metropolis of the world, and the seat, not only of empire and riches, but of the greatest heroism, learning, and politeness, in the world.

SECTION XVII.—*The hopes of the patriarchs of an everlasting possession in Canaan inferred from their choosing a burial place there.*

If *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob* expected an everlasting possession of *Canaan* after death, I believe you will readily agree, that they could never think of Canaan without having that

everlasting possession in their mind, particulary when they ordered themselves to be buried there. And I think this accounts best for all that great particularity which *Moses* uses in relation to the purchase of the burying place in *Machpelah*, before *Mamre*, Gen. xxiii. 13—20.

I think the expectation that God would in the fourth generation (or in about four hundred and seventy years) give *Abraham's* descendants the possession of *Canaan*, was a principle too feeble to animate his heroic conduct in piety, and what has never been seen in human nature. You think it is what has been seen in all ages, in the pains men take to raise their families. But then it is their immediate descendants that they take all that pains to raise. But I think we do not see any man animated to a course of the greatest self-denial, difficulty, and danger, in the prospect of some descendants from him enjoying it four hundred and seventy years after him.

SECTION XVIII.—*On Abraham's sojourning in Canaan.*

You think that all that can be gathered from *Abraham's* staying in *Canaan*, dwelling in tents, and not building himself a city, was, "that God had said he was to live a stranger there, and to die (I suppose you mean *there*) in a good old

age." But I must beg you to refer me to the texts that prove this: I do not remember them. It seems to me that he sojourned there in tents, and without building a city, to show, that he expected his everlasting possession there, in a city to be built in a country where it should become an heavenly one, and whose Builder and Founder was God: a city which He (God) had prepared for him: and that it did not become a man who expected an everlasting possession of such a city, in such a country, to think of going to any other country, or to possessions he had elsewhere, or to live in such a *city* as he could build there. This, the *author* of the *epistle to the Hebrews* says, was the language of his sojourning where he had no possession (instead of returning to those he had in *Ur of the Chaldees*), and to his dwelling in tents there, Heb. xi. 9. 13. 17.

SECTION XIX.—*Lord Barrington's defence of his opinion respecting the son of the Maccabean woman, and the words of Mary and Zacharias.*

I did not make the quotation from 2 Mac. viii. 36, as the only one to my purpose. There are you know several others, v. 9. 11. 14. 23. 29. But I pitched on that as the clearest; and I do not see that you attempt to show how the seven sons died under a covenant of everlasting life.

In my way of referring it to the covenant or promise given to *Abraham* and all his imitators, Gen. xviii. 8, of an everlasting possession of *Canaan*, it is very plain; and that they expected a resurrection to a life over which death should not prevail again, is plain from the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, ch. xi. 25, who says, that *though they were tortured, they would not accept of deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection;* that is, a resurrection that was better than the resurrection of the women's sons mentioned just before; viz. the widow's of Zarepta, and the Shunamite's; because their resurrection to life ended again at last in natural death.

I cannot understand *Mary* and *Zachary* of a spiritual salvation. To me the expressions taken in that sense are all forced and unnatural; especially that of SHEWING MERCY TO OUR FATHERS, AND REMEMBERING *His holy covenant*, Luke i. 72. I think in your way you must insert *the promised;* and so render *to* PERFORM *the mercy* PROMISED *to our fathers*, as our translators do; though without the least foundation.

SECTION XX.—*Our Lord's argument for the resurrection in* Luke xx. 37, 38, *implies that the soul is unconscious in a separate state.*

Our *Saviour's* argument for the resurrection, Luke xx. 37, 38, is an argument to prove that

good men will be raised. I think that is fully made out in the *Essay on the several Dispensations*, &c. vol. ii. 503. The force of the argument does not lie in God's being CALLED the God of *Abraham*, &c.; because then *Matthew* and *Mark* do not repeat it so as to make the argument conclusive; for they do not use that word when they give us an account of this argument. Nor can it lie in these words, *God is the God of the living, and not of the dead.* What proof is it, Sir, that *Abraham* shall be raised, that his soul now acts and enjoys in a separate state? Instead of a resurrection being a consequence from this, I think it must be entirely overthrown by it; because I see no use of *Abraham's* being raised, if Abraham's soul can act and enjoy without his being raised. Besides that, supposing the souls of good men are conscious in a separate state, the persons, whose souls they are, are not said to be *living*, in the language of Scripture. The style of Scripture is the reverse, and ever calls persons dead till their souls at the resurrection are reunited to their proper bodies. This is the style of Scripture every where; which always speaks of the dead being raised, but never speaks of the living being raised; and when *St. John* had described the first resurrection, Rev. xx. 4, he says expressly that *the rest of the dead lived not till the end of the thousand years*, v. 5. So that the force of our *Saviour's argument* for a

resurrection can by no means lie in God's being the God of the LIVING, as you would explain that phrase.

I find I have not expressed myself so in shewing where I think the force of this argument lies, as to make myself understood. I will endeavour to express my meaning more clearly. Moses' history informs us that when God appeared at the bush, God called Himself, or said, *I am the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.* What reason had God for giving Himself that title? The sole reason and foundation of that title is God's promise to *Abraham,* Gen. xvii. 7, *And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in* (all) *their generations; to be a God to thee, and to thy seed after thee.* Then He shews in what sense He will be their God, v. 8, *And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land of thy sojourning, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession: and* (thus) *I will be their God.* Abraham is the first to whom God ever promised to be a *God,* or a Father, or the Giver of an inheritance; and this is the first time He ever promised that inheritance to *Abraham;* I mean, so as to specify what it should be, He renewed this covenant with *Isaac* and *Jacob.* Why then, Sir, to be, or to be called the God of Abraham, is to be, or to be called the adopting Father of Abraham; and, in particular, the Giver of an everlasting possession of *Canaan* to *Abra-*

ham for an inheritance. Now since God *was*, or was called, the God of *Abraham*, &c. at the bush, when *Abraham*, *Isaac*, &c. were all among the dead, God must raise them up, or He cannot be, or be called their God; that is, their Father by adoption, and, in particular, the Giver of an everlasting possession in Canaan to them: for, as it follows, *God is not the God of* (or the giver of an everlasting possession to) *the dead* (since they cannot receive it), *but of* (or to) *the living*, who alone can receive it. *For all* (good men about whom the question was) *live* WITH *Him*. So, Sir, you know it may be rendered as well as TO HIM by the rules of grammar: and the sense requires that it should be so rendered. And all LIVE with Him, is the same as all SHALL live with Him. As the sense of the *dead are raised*, v. 37, is the same as that the dead SHALL be raised. And the sense of *Moses calleth God*, is the same as Moses DID call God: but thus far the argument only concludes in favour of the resurrection of *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob;* which it must be allowed was not the question; but the resurrection of all good men that are dead. You are satisfied, I see, if our *Saviour's* argument concludes strongly for the resurrection of *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*, though it concludes only that God is able to raise others, and that there is some probability that He will. This I own does not satisfy me. I cannot but think our

Saviour's argument concluded strongly for a resurrection of all good men, in so important a point, against the greatest enemies of His doctrine, both from the regard we owe to His argument, and from the great effect it produced on the company; procuring an utter silence from the *Sadducees*, not only at that time, as you term it, but for ever afterwards (as despairing to get the better of Him in any other point), and a great applause from the *Pharisees*. To show therefore the conclusiveness of our *Saviour's* argument for the resurrection of all good men; it must be remembered, that when in *Genesis* God had promised to be the God of *Abraham*, and at the same time, particularly, to give him *Canaan* for an everlasting possession, He had likewise promised to be a God unto his seed in (all) their generations, or unto all his spiritual seed in all ages; and to give THEM *Canaan* for an everlasting possession also: so that our Saviour's argument concludes equally for the resurrection of all Abraham's spiritual seed, as it does for the resurrection of *Abraham* himself, though that part is not expressed.

SECTION XXI.—*The fact of a resurrection inferred from the Talmud, and from certain passages in the Pentateuch.*

I think the argument that the *Talmud* draws for a resurrection from Exod. vi. 8, and Deut. xi. 9, has great force in it; because God established a covenant with *Abraham* to give HIM an everlasting possession of *Canaan* (Gen. xviii. 8), as well as *unto his seed:* and Abraham's possession can be only a possession in his own person, as has been observed before. But I think the argument cannot be as you put it; for a covenant between two parties cannot possibly require that the two parties should subsist to see the performance of it. If I should covenant with your son (if you had one) my estate, at the expiration of the term of seven years, does this imply that you and I must live to see this covenant performed? The law will oblige my representatives to perform this covenant to your son, though we should both die before the performance.

Since *Moses* informs us (Gen. xv. 1), that God told *Abraham* that He *would be his exceeding great reward*, and that exceeding great reward comes out afterwards to be the everlasting possession of *Canaan* after death, ch. xvii. 7, 8, I think it is more agreeable to the rules of interpretation to suppose, that an author so well

versed in *Moses'* writings as the *author* of the *epistle to the Hebrews* appears to have been, when he uses these words, *the recompense of* REWARD, in relation to *Moses*, should be understood to mean the everlasting possession of *Canaan*, rather than the honour of leading the children of *Israel* to the promised land: besides, I reckon that the author of the epistle to the *Hebrews* "cannot mean his conducting the children of Israel to the land of CANAAN as the recompense of reward;" because he reckons that to have been his affliction; *the affliction that he suffered with the people of God*, and which HE PREFERRED *to all the treasures of Egypt*, and *to have borne the reproach of Christ* (or of the anointed people), which *he preferred to the honour of being called the son of Pharaoh's daughter;* and that the recompense of reward, to which he had his eye, was what made him choose to suffer those afflictions with the people of God, and to esteem that reproach of Christ, or of the anointed people; and therefore cannot be those afflictions, or that reproach, but something very different from them, and even some future thing, to which he had his eye.

SECTION XXII.—*Meaning of the word "blessing" in the Old Testament.*

"*Blessing,*" in its original acceptation, signifying all the blessedness of our first parents, before any part of the curse took place that was pronounced upon them, and the blessedness that David speaks of in the xxxiid Psalm being interpreted by *St. Paul* to stand for the whole blessedness that our final justification shall give us, Rom. iv. 2, 3. 9. 11 (as blessing all it does, Gal. iii. 8, 9, compared with v. 14 and ver. 29), when (as *St. John* tells us, Rev. xxii. 3) *there shall be no more curse,* and when all the original *blessing* shall be restored, v. 14; I think I am very well warranted from these considerations to give *blessedness* in the xxxiid Psalm that extended signification which you complain of as not necessarily belonging to it.

SECTION XXIII.—*On Solomon's notion of everlasting life,* Prov. iii. 16—19.

If *Solomon* means everlasting life, by the tree of life, which he asserts Wisdom to be, Prov. iii. 16—19, the passage rises very beautifully; otherwise it is flat and inaccurate. Let us try it both ways. "In Wisdom's right hand are length of days, or long life; in her left hand riches and honour. And as all her ways

entitle us to honour and the esteem of others, so they likewise afford both peace and pleasure to our own minds here, and such an everlasting life hereafter, as the tree of life would have afforded mankind, if they had not been debarred from it." Let us put it the other way. "In Wisdom's right hand is long life; in her left hand riches and the esteem of others; all her ways at the same time give both peace and pleasure to our own minds; and she gives long life." You will agree, I dare say, that nothing can be more against the rules of good writing than the last paraphrase, or more agreeable to them than the first.

If *Solomon* and the other sacred writers were of opinion, that as all bodies went to the grave, so all souls went to *hades*, the house of unconsciousness and silence (Eccl. ix. 10. Psalm cv. 17. Isaiah xxxviii. 18, according to the version of the LXX), and were of opinion, that as long as the body lay in the grave, and the soul continued in *hades*, there was no thought or action; then I think judgment must, with them, presuppose a resurrection. And that I take to have been the case. It is men, and not the souls of men, that are every where in Scripture said to *die*, to *rise*, and to be *judged*.

SECTION XXIV.—*The new heaven and the new earth probably figured the paradisaical state in the land of Canaan.*

I own there may be a *new heaven and a new earth*, without a paradisaical state in *Canaan;* but, putting the passages of Scripture together, which relate to that matter, from the xviith of Genesis to the end of the book of *Revelation*, I think it most probable, that the new heaven, and new earth, means the paradisaical state in *Canaan.* The natural and easy meaning of *restitution of all things* is the restoring them to their first state; that is, to their paradisaical state. But language will not allow us to make the restitution of all things mean the accomplishment of predictions. But if it would, I do not apprehend it would alter the case much: for I think the prophets foretell the restitution of all things to the paradisaical state.

If the temporal salvation of some good men be to the eternal perdition, that the ungodly have suffered in several instances, as the flood, &c.; I confess then I should be of your opinion, and think "that these judgments, and the salvation from them, weakened the expectation of a future state; especially considering some circumstances that you very justly fling into this consideration;" but I think the eternal perdition of ungodly men can only be equalled by the

eternal salvation of good men. And if that way of thinking be just, I conclude men in the early ages of the world would argue from such judgments as eternally destroyed the wicked, for an everlasting salvation of the righteous.

SECTION XXV.—*A defence of Lord Barrington's opinion concerning Asaph.*

If *Asaph* at last attained to a belief of a future recompense to good men, then there are indications of a future recompense before Daniel. That is the main question between us. Whether it is to be in a paradisaical state of *Canaan,* is but incidentally flung in by me, in my two last letters, in order to open my whole mind to you, not indeed with the art of a disputant, who says no more than is absolutely necessary to support his point; but with the frankness of a friend of truth, corresponding with you on a subject to which I invited you.

I cannot but think the words, Psalm xvii. 15, words that are plainly expressive of a resurrection. But you are stumbled when you reflect how good men could be so disturbed at the prosperity of the wicked, consistently with that belief. I do not know that the texts that express this disturbance are so frequent as you seem to think them. As far as I know, they are but few. And why must those few be supposed

to be the real sentiments of the authors of those compositions, where this objection occurs? What is a more common way of writing, especially in poetical performances, than to state an objection in the strongest manner, only to give the better answer to it? And I think such answers are given wherever this difficulty is put.

SECTION XXVI.—*The everlasting promise to Abraham pointed at in* 1 Chron. xvi. 15, *and in* Acts vii. 5, 6, 7.

I apprehend that the promise made to *Abraham* of the everlasting possession of *Canaan* is pointed out, 1 Chron. xvi. 15, in these words, *Be ye mindful always of* HIS COVENANT. God calls the promise of giving *Abraham* and his seed *Canaan* for an everlasting possession, MY COVENANT, κατ' ἐξοχήν, Gen. xvii. 7. 19. 21; whereas the promise, Gen. xv., to give *Canaan* to *Abraham's* seed, in the fourth generation, is only called A *covenant*, v. 18. This His covenant is also pointed out in the words that follow. (1 Chron. xvi. 15), *The word which He* COMMANDED *to a* THOUSAND GENERATIONS. That is, I think, circumcision, which He commanded in all their generations, Gen. xvii. 9; and circumcision was, *inter alia*, a sign and token that God would perform His promise of giving *Abraham* and his *seed Canaan* for an everlasting posses-

sion. This His covenant is likewise pointed out, 1 Chron. xvi. 17, in these words: *an* EVERLASTING *covenant* being so called, Gen. xvii. 8. 13, 14, as being a covenant of the *everlasting possession of Canaan*, v. 8.

I likewise think the promise of *Abraham's* posterity's inheriting *Canaan*, in the fourth generation, is hinted by *St. Stephen*, Acts vii. 5, 6, 7, referring to the history of that promise, as it is recorded, Gen. xv. 18. And I think the promise to give *Abraham* the everlasting possession of *Canaan* is hinted by Stephen under the notion of the covenant of *circumcision*, v. 8, referring to Gen. xvii. 8, 9. The covenant of circumcision is the covenant that circumcision was a sign and seal of, as I have just said.

SECTION XXVII.—*Lord Barrington's theory consistent with the words of Abraham*, Gen. xviii. 25.

You think *Abraham* could not have any expectation of a future reward, even after he had received all these promises; because he expresses himself on the occasion of a temporal calamity to be brought on *Sodom and Gomorrah*, as he does, Gen. xviii. 25. If he had expressed himself so on occasion of a common calamity that was to have been brought on these cities, in the ordinary course of things, I think indeed it would follow, that either *Abraham* had not any

expectation of a future state of rewards for good men; or at least, that through inadvertency, and his overconcern for *Lot* and his family, he had not talked consistently with it. But that was not the case. God is here represented as a Judge, who had heard a great cry of the wickedness of *Sodom and Gomorrah*, and came down to see how it was, and to judge accordingly. He is represented as finding the fact to be true, as sending two angels, extraordinary messengers, to destroy it, and Himself as sending down fire and brimstone from heaven upon them. And surely in such a judicial process it was very fit for *Abraham* to say, notwithstanding his belief in the resurrection of good men to a future life, *Will not the Judge of all the earth do right, and not destroy the righteous with the wicked? Abraham* knew not only that God could not, but that He had not done it in other like judicial proceedings; as in the case of the flood. For though it repented the Lord that He had made man, by reason of his wickedness; yet He saved Noah, whom He had alone found righteous in that generation, Gen. vi. 7. vii. 1.

SECTION XXVIII.—*The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews plainly alludes* (chap. xi.) *to the everlasting possession of Canaan.—A definition of the word "Gospel."*

I have the happiness to agree with you in the view in which you see several branches of the argument in the xith of the *Hebrews*. But I have the misfortune to continue to differ from you about *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*, and about *Moses*. And I cannot imagine what you will do with the 29th verse, where *the author* of the epistle says, of all the worthies he had mentioned in that chapter, that though *they had through faith obtained a good report, yet they had not received the promise.* That promise therefore cannot be the temporal inheritance of *Canaan;* since all from *Joshua* had obtained it. And I beg you will help me to any other promise that could be referred to these, than that of the everlasting possession of *Canaan*. "The promise that *in thee* (*or in thy seed*) *all the families or nations of the earth should be blessed*," is not the promise of sending *Jesus Christ*, but the promise of giving *Canaan* to all *Abraham's* imitators in more general words, which afterwards came to be explained thus; that in blessing Abraham with the promise of the everlasting possession of *Canaan*, He also promised to bless all the nations or families of the earth, that should become

his spiritual seed, with the like everlasting possession. For blessing, as has been observed already, signifies everlasting life. So I said in my former letter it appeared to me to lie in *Genesis*, for which I gave my reasons. And so I add *St. Paul* thought it lay there; for he calls this the *gospel*, Gal. iii. 18; i. e. the good news of everlasting life. So I take *gospel* to signify here; and so it also signifies, Heb. iv. 2; standing there for the good news of an everlasting rest, in the everlasting possession of *Canaan*, that *David* told the *Israelites* of his time yet remained for them, if they would obey God's voice. But I troubled you with so much about this text in my former letter, that it would be impertinent to trouble you with more upon it here. *Gospel* has the same sense with a little variation, Mark i. 1, *The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God;* i. e. the beginning of the good news of eternal life in heaven, brought by *Jesus Christ*, the Son of God, *who hath brought* (heavenly) *life and immortality to light* to the Jews, and life and immortality in general to the Gentiles. And the good news of eternal life in heaven, brought by Jesus Christ, is what is generally signified by the gospel. But I see it will break in too long on the other parts of my answer, if I pursue this argument here as far as it deserves. I will therefore break it off, and add the remainder in a postscript.

SECTION XXIX.—*Daniel gives a clearer revelation of a future life than any of his predecessors or contemporaries.*

It is certain that we find the revelation of a future life clearer in *Daniel* than it was before. All the revelations to the *Jews* about that time grow clearer, as well as this about the resurrection. God had undoubtedly wise ends to serve by it. A people in their distressed circumstances wanted support from the clearer views of the glorious state of the kingdom of the *Messiah*, which is to take place after the first resurrection. From having clearer discoveries from God, concerning the resurrection and eternal life, they spoke more clearly of them than those before had done. And when they understood so fully, *that many who were in the dust of the earth were to arise*, they saw this doctrine expressed and implied in some parts of the former revelation, where otherwise, after so many ages, and the loss of other writings and traditionary interpretations, it might have escaped their notice. But as to "*Isaiah*, *Jeremiah* and *Ezekiel*," I do not wonder they do not "back their calls to repentance with promises of a future life;" because I apprehend they, as all the other Jewish prophets, were sent to the nation, to call it to repentance, on the promise and denunciation of national bless-

ings and curses; but were not sent to call individuals to repentance (to whom alone any thing that is future can belong), as indeed John the Baptist in some sense was, and especially as the apostles afterwards were; namely, to individuals, and to them only. Yet these prophets, in other views, seem to me to speak of the resurrection as I have expressed my sense to you in my former letters.

SECTION XXX.—*The argument from* Psalm xlv. *defended, and the necessity of the close study of revelation strongly urged.*

I begin to think my argument from Psalm xlv. conclusive; since you are pleased to acquaint me, "that you have nothing to offer against it, in which you can satisfy yourself." I agree with you that we should be cautious in all our inquiries; especially in those which relate to the scheme of God's dispensations to mankind; they being of a very great compass, and we having but short accounts of some of them. I assure you I have not set myself to make new discoveries. God is my witness I have had no guide but my Bible, and I have only followed where I thought that would lead me. In going over I have started many of these notions, whilst I have been pursuing other game, and had not the least thought of meeting with

this quarry. I suppose the accounts we have of the dispensations of God to mankind are given to us, that we may search and pry into them. If I can find out nothing, I am thoroughly contented to stay till the whole scene shall be laid open to us in the future state. Yet I apprehend we may be too easy and indolent, as well as too curious and impatient. If *Sir Isaac Newton* had been content to have staid till he arrived at the regions of full light before he had set himself to trace the works of God in the natural world, we had lost his surprising discoveries. If we can spell out any thing in the moral scenes of things, let us thankfully receive it, and make the use, and enjoy the pleasure, that results from it, whilst we live in so deistical an age, and in a world of disappointments, care, and sorrow. *Paul* indeed flung away all his Jewish knowledge, as of no avail to salvation. But "if he had quite flung it away, as of no use at all," we had lost many beautiful allusions, explications, and arguments for the Christian religion, drawn from the Jewish economy scattered up and down all his epistles, and the argument that is so nobly managed against apostatising to Judaism, from the beginning to the end of the epistle to the *Hebrews*.

I think, with you, that a religion that is of the highest value, must be a religion that contains plain directions of duty, and plain promises of

a reward, sufficient to encourage the bulk of mankind to their duty in all circumstances, to strengthen against temptations, to calm the affections, and give comfort under afflictions; and that what must do this must be plain in those articles, or it can be of no use to the unlearned:—such is the Christian religion. But then, as there are first principles in that religion that are plain, and of the greatest use, and consequently the most obvious to the bulk of mankind, so there are doctrines for those that are advancing towards perfection. Such is this of the scheme of God's dispensations to mankind, and of a future reward of a paradisaical *Canaan* previous to the more glorious reward of the *third heaven*. If that be not so clear or certain, I do not see how it can hurt the bulk of mankind. It is much at one to them where they are to be happy after the resurrection, or in what degree. They believe they shall be exceedingly happy: happy enough to reward them infinitely abundantly above all their self-denial and sufferings. But why may not men of more leisure and extended thought see what gradation God has observed in revealing this happiness of the third heaven to us, or when He revealed it? And observe how well this and all other of His revelations of future happiness were suited to the condition of men and things at the time they were made. I cannot

but think these proportions in revelation the greatest proof of the truth of it, and to afford an entertainment to the mind, which makes the histories of kingdoms and empires, and all the boasted scenes of their various changes and revolutions, not only dwindle, but appear as nothing before us.

SECTION XXXI.—*Rule for sound Scriptural interpretation.*

I think we are to interpret passages in the *Old Testament* as we do passages in other books: viz. by the rules of grammar and rhetoric, and by the context. Whatever these rules determine to be the meaning of a passage, we are to take to be the meaning of it. Whatever we take by these rules to be the meaning of the words, we are to suppose they to whom they were spoken or written understood to be the meaning of them, unless we see plain facts to show they did not understand them so. But if, on the other hand, we see facts that show they understood those words according to the common rules of speech, that is a farther proof that they understood them in that sense. And if we find subsequent *writers*, especially inspired, understand them in the same sense, that is a third argument that the persons, to whom they were spoken, understood them as we now

do. I have endeavoured to make this my rule; and after having proved my opinion, the best that I could, from words and facts in the Old Testament, have endeavoured to corroborate the sense I have given them by passages in the New Testament. How well I have squared this, and my former letters, by it, I must submit to you. You at last, after all I have said in my former letters, seem to think that God made no express revelation of future recompenses after this life till Christ came into the world. Yet surely, my good friend, on a little recollection, you will allow that future recompenses after this life were revealed by *Daniel* and the *minor prophets*. I must still be of opinion they were revealed from the beginning. What can be the design of revelation? To discover to us our duty? That is written in our hearts. To discover our duty to us may be of great use indeed, after the law in our hearts is greatly perverted by corrupt traditions and usages; and therefore our *Saviour* dwells much upon it, and with the greatest propriety and advantage; not only natural, but revealed religion having been grossly corrupted by the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, and by the idolatrous priests and theologers under the authority of tradition and oracles, both before and at *His* appearance. But this does not seem to have been the case in the earlier ages of the world. Nor does revelation

from *Adam* to *Moses* turn upon it. On the other hand, supposing men to know their duty, it gives them motives to perform it. These motives must either be the promises and threatenings of this life, or of another. Now I think the promises and threatenings of this life too feeble to animate men to their duty at all times and in all cases; and therefore I should from hence be apt to conclude that it was the promises and threatenings of another life. How feeble would the motive have been to *Adam's* repentance, who had been in *Eden*, had seen himself a son of God there, an heir of dominion, bliss, glory and immortality, to have understood that, if he reined in all his appetites and passions, and was obedient and submissive to God's will in all things, he should, in recompense, have a skin of a beast to cover him from the noxious air, and fruit enough from the sweat of his brow, to furnish him with bread for his sustenance. If God designed to recover *Adam* to his obedience, we must suppose He would use more powerful motives than these: much more if He, in infinite mercy, intended to preserve a generation among his descendants, who, while the greater part of mankind would worship and obey the *devil*, should obey and imitate God, as the children of His family, and preserve His faith and worship alive in the world, and thereby make a people

that should be prepared for the Lord when He came; a people that should be ready to receive Him, and His apostles, whom He sent to call the Gentiles from idolatry and vice to the worship of the one God, through one Mediator, Jesus Christ, the Righteous, and to the practice of all virtue.

SECTION XXXII.—*Recapitulation of the evidence produced from Scripture that the promise to Abraham referred to the everlasting possession of Canaan.*

And as it seems but reasonable on these accounts to think that God would use other motives with mankind for these purposes than temporal rewards and punishments; so I must be of opinion He actually did propose others, till you will be so good as to show me how, among the many texts I have brought to support a contrary opinion, I am, without the help of it, to account for those in particular which follow; as, what the *everlasting possession of Canaan is, that is promised to Abraham, as well as to his seed* IN THEIR GENERATIONS, or in ALL their generations (for none are excepted), when neither *Abraham* nor any of his seed, till the fourth generation, had any possession in *Canaan*, besides a burying place which he purchased of Ephron: how Abraham came to plant a *grove*, and there to call on the name of the Lord, as the

EVERLASTING GOD, soon after God had made a covenant with him to give him the everlasting possession of *Canaan*, Gen. xxi. 33, when He had never done it before; unless it was to praise God as the giver of an everlasting possession to him and his seed after him: how we can, without this notion, understand what the sacred writers meant by *everlasting covenant, everlasting way, everlasting mercy, everlasting kindness, everlasting love, everlasting joy, everlasting salvation, everlasting light, everlasting portion, everlasting inheritance:* expressions that occur in several parts of the Old Testament, and I think all of them before *Daniel?* how our *Saviour's* argument against the Sadducees can be made out to be worthy of Him, without supposing that the foundation of God's calling Himself at the bush, the *God of Abraham*, &c. was God's having promised to be *Abraham's God*, Gen. xvii. 7, and to give him and his spiritual seed *Canaan* for an everlasting possession, v. 8? What is that *heavenly country*, and what that city, that the author of the epistle to the *Hebrews* tells us *Abraham* looked for, whose *Maker and Builder is God?* or *what is that city which God prepared for him, for which reason He was not ashamed to be called his God?* And must not that city be the *heavenly Jerusalem* mentioned in the following chapter, v. 22? which St. John says, *he saw coming down from heaven*

like a bride adorned for her husband, Rev. xxi. 1. What is the *covenant of eternal life* which the seven sons in the *Maccabees* died under? How *Zacharias* could say that Christ came to *shew mercy to our fathers*, viz. *Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, in remembrance of His holy covenant*, &c. but by coming in order to receive and give the Spirit, which was to raise them up to the everlasting possession of *Canaan?* in what sense *Abraham* is said by St. Paul, *to be heir of the world, through the righteousness of faith*, Rom. iv. 13, but as he was to be heir of the paradisaical Canaan: how *God* (*foreseeing that He would justify the Gentiles to eternal life through faith*) *preached the* GOSPEL, or that gospel (viz. of justifying the Gentiles to eternal life) to *Abraham:* unless it was by saying, that all nations should be blessed in Him, i. e. in the good news of the everlasting possession of *Canaan*, belonging to *all* his imitators? What is that promise that none of the *Old Testament*, or *Apocryphal worthies* have obtained, Heb. xi. 39, if it be not paradisaical Canaan? and what is that better thing that God had provided for the Christian *Hebrews*, that without them the *Old Testament* and *Apocryphal worthies* might not be made perfect, if it be not the third heaven? ver. ult. What are the COVENANTS preceding the giving of the law and the service (Rom. ix. 2), if not the two covenants to *Abraham?* The one,

that his carnal seed in the fourth generation should inherit *Canaan*, which is mentioned, Gen. xv.; and that other, that he and his spiritual seed should have the everlasting possession of *Canaan*, which is mentioned, Gen. xvii. What is the inheritance that we believing Gentiles have from God, through *Abraham*, who is the father of us all, Rom. iv. 16, (and which must be supposed to be different from our inheritance from God through Christ, as our Elder Brother,) if it be not the everlasting possession of *Canaan?* For the promise of *Abraham's* being *heir of the world* does not only belong to *Abraham*, but to his *seed*, v. 13. And that promise *is sure to all his seed, not only to that* (faithful seed) *which were of the law* (or the believing Jews), *but to that which is only of the faith of Abraham* (i. e. the believing *Gentiles*), v. 16. For we are but ONE SEED (Gal. iii. 16), *being all one* (seed) *by faith in Christ Jesus. And if we are all one* (seed) *in Christ Jesus* (as the *Clermont* copy reads it), *then are we Abraham's seed, and* (Abraham's) *heirs according to the promise*, viz. the promise made to *Abraham*, Gen. xiii. 3, explained, Gen. xvii. 8, and confirmed, Gen. xxii. 18. For he was the original grantee of the everlasting possession of *Canaan;* and we come to be entitled to an everlasting possession in it through our adoption in him; or, in other words, as his seed, i. e. his imitators.

When and how are *the meek to inherit the earth,* as our Saviour tells us they yet shall (Matt. v. 5), even so long after it had been said that they should inherit it, Psalm xxxvii. 2? And what *is the* HUNDRED FOLD *that they shall receive in this* TIME WITH PERSECUTION, who have lost houses and LANDS for Christ's sake, *as well as in the world to come life everlasting?* And when and where shall they have that hundred fold (Mark x. 29, 30), unless it be in *Canaan*, at the thousand years' reign? What is *Solomon's tree of life*, that Wisdom is to those that find her, over and above long life, riches, honour, pleasantness and peace? What is the *restitution* of all things, that God spake of by the mouth of all His holy *prophets* since the world began (Acts iii. 21), but the everlasting possession of Paradise, hinted probably in the sermons of the antediluvian prophets and preachers of righteousness, and most expressly promised to *Abraham, Isaac and Jacob?* How were the Gentile *Ephesians* chosen (to eternal life) before the foundation of the world (πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου), or before the Jewish state (Eph. i. 4), but in God's giving the everlasting possession of *Canaan* to all *Abraham's* imitators? or, to add no more, where was *eternal life promised by God before the world began* (or before the times of ages or jubilees, πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, i. e. before the Jewish state commenced), and which was

afterwards manifested to the *Gentiles* through *Paul's* preaching (Tit. i. 2, 3), but in the promise of this everlasting possession of *Canaan* to *Abraham*, and all his spiritual seed, of what nations or family soever they should be?

I return you my hearty thanks for all the objections you have urged against my opinion, as far as it has been expressed either in so much of the *Essay*, &c. as I have espoused, or as far as I have endeavoured to support it in my two former letters. Your objections have put me upon reconsidering the matter carefully, as several of them required I should; from the most plausible manner in which you have urged them, and from their being the best that I believe can be urged. I flatter myself you will acquit me from any breach of the promise I made you in the beginning of my letter. I am sure I have had no reserve. I wish my letter as faultless in every other respect. If any thing occurs to you, that you think may assist my inquiries on this subject, be so kind as to impart it to me. May the God of truth lead us into it, and direct our inquiries for the promoting it!

When I received your letter I was very ill. My sickness continued for some time. Before I was well recovered I took a journey into Essex, at the time I had the pleasure to see you in my way. There I found my hands

full; and so they have been ever since my return, in order to get up the arrears of business here that my journey had brought upon me. I got the first hours of leisure last week; and as soon as I could get my letter transcribed, and an opportunity of a private conveyance for a long epistle, on a subject that will not pay the postage, I have transmitted it to you, with the best assurances, that I can give you at a distance, that

I am, Reverend Sir,

your very faithful,

humble servant,

BARRINGTON.

SECTION I.—*Passages from Job, which shew that he had an expectation of a future life.*

P. S. Though I gave up the famous passage in *Job* in mine of *January* 4th, as not relating to the resurrection, yet I think there are passages in that book that plainly shew that *Job* had an expectation of a future life. Ch. xiii. 15, 16, he seems to me to say, "that as the waters fail from the sea at the tide of ebb, and return at the tide of flood, and as a flood of rain is dried up, but yet returns on the next great rains;" *so man lieth down in the grave, and riseth not till the heavens be no more; nor will they till then*

awake, and be raised out of their sleep. See also v. 14, 15, and chap. xxvii. 8. He asks, *What is the hope of the hypocrite, though he hath gained, when God taketh away his soul?* This is a question that I think he could not possibly have asked, unless he had supposed that a sincere man had the best reason for hope when God took him out of the world.

SECTION II.—*The promise,* Gen. xiii. 3, *and* xxii. 18, *does not refer to our Lord, but to Abraham's spiritual seed.*

I will now endeavour to show that the promise which God made to *Abraham,* Gen. xiii. 3. xxii. 18, *In thee or in thy seed I will bless all the nations of the earth* (as it is quoted and argued by *St. Paul,* Gal. iii. 8), does not mean, that *in* or by one of thy descendants, namely, Jesus Christ, I will bless all the nations of the earth; but that it means that I will bless all that shall become thy spiritual seed, or that shall imitate thee. In order to it, you must give me leave to premise, 1st, that in my way of understanding the 2d and 3d of the *Galatians,* with *St. Paul,* justification (ch. ii. 16. iii. 18), or *accounting for righteousness* (v. 6), *the spirit* (v. 2. 5. 14), blessing, or *the blessing of Abraham* (v. 8, 9—14), gospel, (v. 8), life (v. 21), and *inheritance* (v. 18), are

in effect the same thing, and are promiscuously used by him in this chapter, as any one of these terms will best suit the other expressions he has occasion to use in the several parts of it. I think the promiscuous use of these terms may be very well accounted for thus: *justification* is God's final acquittal of a man from a charge; which, if it had been true, must have ended in death; but which, being adjudged to be false, brings on the sentence of eternal life: this acquittal or justification is, in other words, being *accounted righteous:* or *having truth* (i. e. sincere obedience) *accounted for righteousness. The Spirit* is to raise us up to eternal life, and was, in the mean time, the earnest of that resurrection to the *Galatians: blessing* signifies, the removal of the *curse*, and the restoration of the original blessing, namely, bliss and immortality. The *blessing of Abraham*, is the blessing promised to *Abraham;* viz. that which was promised in general terms to him, Gen. xiii. 3, *In thee shall all families* (or nations) *be blessed;* but which came to be more particularly explained, ch. xvii. 7, 8, that God would bless *Abraham* and all his seed (or his pious imitators) with the everlasting possession of *Canaan* (called therefore an *inheritance*, Gal. iii. 18), and which God afterwards confirms by an oath, *that in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed*, Gen. xxii. 18; so that *St. Paul* makes no difference

between any of these three promises, the second being but an explication of the first; and the third but a confirmation of the first and second by the oath of God. Yet the first promise is more generally referred to by *St. Paul* in this chapter; particularly v. 17, as plainly appears by the note of time that he adds; for it is 430 years before the giving of the law that God said to *Abraham* (Gen. xiii. 3), *In thee shall all nations be blessed. Life* is eternal life; *inheritance* is that right we have to it; and *gospel* is the good news either of the title, or of the actual inheritance of it.

2. I must premise that *St. Paul* uses *promise* and *covenant* promiscuously; both of them signifying the promise or covenant that God would give *justification, righteousness, the Spirit, blessing,* or *the blessing of Abraham, inheritance* or *life,* and *glad tidings to Abraham and his seed.*

3. Moreover, *seed,* or *one seed,* in this chapter signifies, *Abraham's* one believing seed of all nations, particularly of Jews and Gentiles, now made one by being baptized into *Jesus Christ,* and putting on Christ, v. 27 (as Christians used to do new clothes after baptism), whereby, without any manner of distinction of *Jew or Gentile, bond or free, male or female,* we all become one seed; whereas he, that was not of *Abraham's* family, or that was an hired servant in it, or a female, could not be circumcised.

And as the *apostle* adds, *if we be one seed in Christ Jesus* (as the Clermont copy reads it, and that is to be sure the true reading), *then are we Abraham's seed* (or one seed), *and heirs according to the promise;* that is to say, more generally, heirs of the blessing of *Abraham*, that was promised, Gen. xiii. 3; or, more particularly, heirs of the everlasting possession of *Canaan*, promised Gen. xvii. 7, 8, and confirmed by an oath to his seed, or to those who should be his imitators, Gen. xxii. 18. This seed, or one seed, stands with *St. Paul* in opposition to *seeds*, or two sorts of seed, viz. *those that are of faith* (ἐκ πίστεως), v. 7, and those that are *of the works of the law* (ἐξ ἔργων νόμου), v. 10. *St. Paul* speaks of these two sorts of seeds, Rom. iv. 13—18, and ix. 6—9; only he varies the expression in the last place, calling the two seeds, the *seed of* (or according to) *the flesh;* and *the seed of* (or according to) *the* promise. *St. Peter* speaks in the like strain, Acts iii. 25, 26: *Ye are the children of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed.* And therefore adds, *Unto you* (as part of that seed) *first* (*God having raised up His Son Jesus*) *sent Him to bless you, in turning every one of you from* HIS INIQUITIES. In consequence of which they would certainly become righteous, and of course obtain justification to eternal life; expressed by

St. Peter, v. 19. 21, by *their sins being blotted out, when the times of refreshing should come from the presence of the Lord* (*who will be revealed against the wicked in flaming fire*) ; and by the *restitution of all things*, viz. to their paradisaical state. By all this I think it appears, that the blessing promised to *Abraham*, in these words, *In thee, or in thy seed, shall all the nations of the earth be blessed* (as the words stand in *Genesis*, and according to the interpretation of all the New Testament *writers* that quote them), signify the good news of everlasting life (or of the *Spirit*, who is to raise us up to everlasting life), and not Jesus Christ, notwithstanding that He was of the seed of *Abraham* according to the flesh. But this will appear more fully by what follows.

4. In the last place, *St. Paul* gives this one seed a name in the singular number, viz. *Christ*, v. 16, 17 ; that is, the *anointed* (viz. seed). This one seed having received the promise of the *Spirit*, or the spirit that had been promised, (which is our unction, 2 Cor. i. 21, 22. 1 John ii. 20. 27), v. 14. Christ has this signification, Psalm cv. 15 (*teach not mine anointed*, Χριστοὺς, according to the LXX), and Heb. xi. 26. That the *seed* (or the one seed), v. 16, signifies all those who are made one, by being anointed with one Spirit, or by being baptized into one Spirit, as the one Spirit of the one Lord (Media-

tor), and of one God, even the Father, and does not mean *Jesus Christ*, will appear more plainly if we consider the thread of *St. Paul's* argument in the *Galatians*. His argument is to prove, that the Galatians as well as other *Gentiles*, and even the Jews, were justified by faith, and not by the works of the law, ch. ii. 16; and the sum of his argument to support this assertion is, that they received the Spirit (the earnest of this resurrection, and by which they should at last be raised from the dead), by believing the word which they had heard from *Paul*, and not by the works of the law, v. 2; just as he (viz. *Paul*) that ministered the Spirit to them, and wrought other great miracles among them (the special miracles of an apostle), did it by the faith of that word of the gospel, which he had heard from Christ, and not by the works of the law, v. 5; and just as *Abraham* was justified by believing, v. 6. He therefore adds that men only became the children (or seed) of *Abraham* by believing God, as *Abraham* did, or by imitating his faith, v. 7; and God, foreseeing that He would (in His due time) justify the heathen (or all nations) to eternal life through faith, preached the good news beforehand to *Abraham*, in the promise made to him, Gen. xiii. 3, *In thee shall all nations be blessed*, v. 8; so that it follows, that *all they which be of faith* (or of the seed of faith, ἐκ πίστεως) *are*

(now and were then) *blessed* (along) *with faithful Abraham*, v. 9; whereas, on the contrary, that seed of *Abraham*, who are ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, must be under the curse of the law, instead of the blessing (or justification to eternal life), according to the doctrine of the Testament itself; *Habakkuk*, having asserted, *that the just* (or righteous) *shall live* (that is, eternally) *by faith* (i. e. by faith or faithfulness alone) (whereas in truth *Christ* has died to redeem us *Jews* from the curse that we were under by the law, being made a curse for *us*, and to impart the blessing of *Abraham* to the Gentiles, through their faith in the word, which they had heard from *St. Paul*, v. 10—14). Now, adds *St. Paul*, a covenant among men is a thing that cannot be uttered by any but the parties themselves: it is unalterable by any one else, v. 15: but (the covenants or) the promises that God made to *Abraham*, He made to *Abraham* and to his seed, v. 16. So they run, Gen. xiii. 3. xvii. 7, 8. xxii. 18. Then it cannot be to SEEDS; for seed is but one sort of seed, and not two or more sorts of seeds. Now, says he, that one seed is *Christ*, or all the people that are anointed with the Spirit; and therefore the promises of blessing belong to you, who are of the one seed of faith, and have by it received the Spirit. And, as he adds, if any should suggest to you, that the law has disannulled the promise, that *in thy seed shall all*

nations be blessed, which God *had confirmed* (by an oath, Gen. xxii. 18) *to Christ* εἰς Χριστὸν, i. e. to the anointed people); I answer, that it is impossible: because the first promise of that kind, made Gen. xiii. 3 (explained and confirmed by the promise, Gen. xvii. 7, 8, and xxii. 18), was four hundred and thirty years before the law, v. 17; whereas, on the contrary, if the inheritance of blessing to *Abraham* had been given by the law, it could not have been given by the promise, as it most certainly was; as may be plainly seen, Gen. xiii. 3. xvii. 7, 8. xxii. 18. And if it should still be said, why then was the law added? *St. Paul* answers, it was added to show the Israelites the punishment due to every transgression of the law of nature, by giving them such a number of more precepts than there were in the law of nature, and by making death the penalty of the breach of a great many of them; that so the Jews, seeing themselves so manifestly *concluded under sin*, both by frequent breaches of the numerous laws they were under, and by death, that often followed, might be led by the law to the gospel, where they would see that they might obtain righteousness and life. But this law was only added till that one seed should come, to whom the *promise* of *life* and *blessedness* is made; which one seed is made up of a body of Jews and Gentiles, by one faith in one God, through one Lord, and by

one Spirit. This law was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator, viz. *Moses*, v. 19. But still, says he, this very thought suggests another, that may farther serve to show that the law could not vacate the promise made to *Abraham* and his seed; because Moses (as Mr. Locke first showed us), who was the mediator at the giving of the law at *Sinai*, was only a mediator of a covenant, where but one of the parties concurred that concurred to *Abraham's* covenant. For Abraham's covenant was a covenant between God and *Abraham*, and his one seed of faith. Now *Moses* was only a mediator between God (one of the parties indeed), but was not a mediator between God and *Abraham* and the one seed of faith, the other party to *Abraham's* covenant; for *Abraham*, and the Gentiles of all nations, who were part of that one seed of faith, were not there: whereas if *Moses* had been a mediator of such a covenant at *Sinai* as could have vacated the covenant with *Abraham* and his seed, he should have been a mediator of a covenant between both those parties (viz. God, *Abraham*, and his spiritual seed of all nations), and not of a covenant between one of those parties only, viz. God and quite another party (the carnal seed of *Abraham* by *Isaac* and *Jacob*), which was the case at *Sinai*, v. 20. *St. Paul* then intersperses some thoughts to show that the law,

instead of being intended to be against the promises, which God made to *Abraham*, or to vacate them, by giving righteousness and life (which was alone to be had by faith in the promise), was only intended to bring us all to the faith of Christ, by which alone the body of the Gentiles come to be children of God, and with the believing Jews, v. 25. He then brings his last argument, to show that we become one seed by faith in God (through the word of God, preached by Christ and His apostles), from the significant rite of initiation, by which we are baptized into one body and one spirit; and then concludes, v. ult., *that if we are one* (seed) *in* (by faith in God through) *Christ Jesus, then are we Abraham's* (one) *seed* (to whom the promise was made, Gen. xiii. 3, as explained, xvii. 7, 8, and confirmed, xxii. 18), *and* (consequently) *heirs according to the promise.*

Lord Barrington to Dr. Lardner.

Becket House, December 30, 1729.

SECTION I.—*Importance of frequently referring to the Old Testament in expounding the New.*

Rev. Sir,—I cannot but own that I wish, with you, "that Christianity may be proved from the New Testament alone, without being under a necessity of recurring to the Old Testament for proofs. I am also of opinion, with those late defenders of Christianity that think it may be so proved;" at least that it may be so proved to us Gentiles. But then I also think, that it cannot be so clearly understood, so fully proved, or so well vindicated, even to us, if we do not recur to the Old Testament, as if we do. And I at the same time think that we must necessarily recur to the Old Testament, in order to convince a *Jew* that *Jesus* is the Messiah, promised, and foretold to the Fathers, to justify several of our *Saviour's* assertions concerning His own character, and the prophecies to which He

refers; and to remove those objections, where a *Jew* will be apt to stick, notwithstanding all the proof we can bring to convince him.

SECTION II.—*It is probable that God chose Abraham because he was singularly pious in the midst of an idolatrous generation.*

As God does every thing in the natural world *in number, weight and measure*, so He undoubtedly does in the moral world too. I can never suppose that God shows favour to men blindly, or according to mere arbitrary pleasure, since He never acts but according to the *counsel of His will.* I cannot but think Divine favours were always proportioned to the inward dispositions, or to the outward appearances of virtue, in an age when nothing was known of the rewards of Heaven, or that they would be proportioned to men's sufferings in this life, if they behaved themselves suitably under them. When I see God, then, not barely hold forth *Abraham* as His friend, but single him out visibly and immediately to the men of his own time, and to believers in all ages, for such high favours, as making him remarkably great, rich, and powerful, highly esteemed and honoured; victorious in battle; receiving a reversionary grant of the finest country in the world in the fourth generation; blessed with a beloved

son by his beloved *Sarah* in his old age, and endued with a new youthful vigour for the great part of the remainder of his life; having the glory of God frequently appearing to him, and conversing familiarly with him; and at last adopting him to the everlasting possession of *Canaan*, by a resurrection from the dead, at the restitution of all things; when I see all this confirmed to him by a covenant, and by the oath of God; and finally observe, not only the singular honour of his being called the friend of God, but the father of the faithful in all ages (they being to derive their immediate title to paradise as his children, who is himself to be the heir of the new world); I say, when I consider all this, I cannot but suppose that *Abraham* was a singular instance of known and distinguished piety in the age in which he lived. And therefore I should from hence conclude, that if men were at that time generally idolaters, *Abraham* was not. *Enoch* was translated to paradise because he was singularly pious, and *walked with God;* as *Adam* had done in innocence, till guilt made him run away from God, and hide himself. God saved *Noah* from the flood, because He *had seen him* ALONE RIGHTEOUS *in that generation.* God's providences are similar in similar cases. It is likely therefore that *Abraham*, who was thus distinguished in his age by the favour of God, as *Enoch* and

Noah were in theirs, was likewise as singular in his piety as his two most singularly pious ancestors. We have reason to think, from several testimonies of Scripture, that the best men in the world, *Abraham's* immediate *ancestors*, descendants of the blessed *Shem*, were all infected with idolatry. It is most natural then to think, that, since *Abraham* was thus distinguished by Providence, he was clear of it. Besides, *Joshua*, who charges *Terah* and *Nachor* with worshipping idols, does not charge *Abraham* with it, though he mentions him, Josh. xxiv. 2. That seems to me fairly to acquit him. I need not tell one so perfectly acquainted with *Josephus* as you are, that he goes farther, and says, that *Abraham* argued against the idolatry of his relations before he came out of *Ur* of the *Chaldees*. I hope I do not misrepresent *Josephus*, though I quote him *memoriter*. I think he says this in his *first book* of *Antiquities*.

SECTION III.—*On the character of Melchisedek.*

I have been so little able to satisfy myself about *Melchisedek*, that I confess any objection fetched from that instance against the singularity of *Abraham's* worshipping the only true God without images, cannot have great weight with me. I should think, if *Melchisedek* was a man, and every way as free from idolatry and vice as

Abraham, there would be less beauty and wisdom in Providence's making Abraham so much more illustrious (at least in history) than *Melchisedek*. Perhaps *Melchisedek*, though no polytheist, since he was a priest of the Most High God, yet might be an idolater. *Abimelech* is said to be one that feared God, and yet most likely was not freer from the worship of idols than *Terah*, and *Nachor*, and all Nachor's descendants. *Balaam* was a worshipper of the true God, and a prophet, and yet was a *sorcerer*. I do not know any harm that can come from supposing *Melchisedek* to have worshipped the true God by images (notwithstanding he was thus distinguished by Providence), provided his worship was less gross than others, and he a man of remarkable piety. Why might he not in that case, according to rules of the strictest proportion, be honoured with the singular character of king of righteousness, and priest of the Most High God, and be an antitype of the royal, eternal and unchangeable priesthood of Christ? But if *Abraham* was more distinguished by the singular friendship of the supreme Being than *Melchisedek*, as he seems to have been, methinks I would willingly have it appear, that that singular friendship was founded on the most singular piety and worth. However, I must own there is a good deal of uncertainty in what I have said about *Melchisedek*. Perhaps

Melchisedek may be thought, not only to be a person of an higher dignity than *Abraham*, as to be sure he was; but also to have been more remarkably, visibly, and perhaps immediately distinguished by Providence, in the instances just now mentioned, than *Abraham* himself was, by all that is recorded about him in Scripture. If this should be so, why then he might not only be equally pious with *Abraham*, but even in a superior degree; and yet a just proportion have been observed by Providence in the distribution of its rewards to these two. That is the great point, as you will easily see, that I am so desirous to secure: and in that, I dare say, I shall have your concurrence.

SECTION IV.—*Remarks on* Gen. iv. 1 and 3.

If *Eve's* saying, *I have gotten a man from the Lord*, Gen. iv. 1, be of the same import with *Moses'* saying, that *Adam begat a son in his own likeness, after his image*, Gen. v. 3, in the connexion which these last words have with the two verses that immediately precede; I must then think yours a good answer to my allegation. Bear with me, however, whilst I own that I cannot help being of a different opinion. What you, with great sagacity, assign as the reason of *Moses'* repeating words in the case of *Seth*, which you suppose to be of equal force with

those which he had used before on the birth of *Cain*, is extremely ingenious; but yet would, in my apprehension, have been much stronger if all the *antediluvians* had been descended from *Seth*, as it is generally thought the *postdiluvians* are.

SECTION V.—*Further observations on the word of our Lord to the penitent thief. See Letter* iii. *Section* ix.

I have the happiness to agree with you; yet there must be an emphasis laid on *this day*, in what our Saviour says *to the thief on the cross.* But I think the emphasis lies, not in the thief being *to be with Christ that day in paradise*, but in our Saviour's *saying it to him, that day*, or at that hour; which was the hour of his weakness, and the power of darkness. And I apprehend that our Saviour takes notice of *this day*, as the hour of His weakness, and the power of darkness, on purpose that the thief might not be discouraged by seeing Him in those circumstances: He therefore then assures him most expressly, that notwithstanding those his own circumstances of weakness, yet he should be with Him in paradise; viz. at the time when that state of His kingdom should come, in which He is to reward His servants, and consequently when He could remember him to purpose. I should also think that a man, who

had been a thief, and was suffering for that crime, may reasonably be supposed to have had some doubt mixed with his hope, whether Christ would remember him when He came into His kingdom, or no, and might be highly thankful to have the most express assurance from Him that He would; though he did not understand our *Saviour* as having any intention to have him with Him in paradise that day.

SECTION VI.—*An objection to the theory respecting the paradisaical state, from* Psalm cv. 8, 9, *noticed and answered.*

You do me the honour to approve of what I have said concerning the promise of an everlasting possession of *Canaan* to *Abraham* and his imitators after death, and to acquiesce in it. Yet give me leave to state a difficulty to you, which has occurred to me since my last, together with the answer that satisfies me, and to ask your opinion of it. I flatter myself you will not think this to be unbecoming a free inquirer after truth. Psalm cv. 8, 9, the *Psalmist* says, as our copies and versions read it, HE [God] HATH REMEMBERED HIS COVENANT FOR EVER, *the word which He commanded to a thousand generations: the covenant which He made with Abraham, saying, Unto thee will I give the land of Canaan, the lot of your inheritance. And gave*

them the lands of the heathen, and they inherited the labour of the people, v. 44. God is here said *to have remembered His covenant for ever*, [i. e. His covenant to give the everlasting possession of Canaan to Abraham and his seed,] called by God MY *covenant*, Gen. xvii. 2. 4. 7, *the word which He commanded to a thousand generations;* [i. e. the commandment of circumcision, which was to be observed throughout all their generations, and which was enjoined at the time when He established His covenant with *Abraham* to give him and his seed the everlasting possession of *Canaan*, Gen. xvii.;] and God is said in this *Psalm* to have remembered it, by having given them the lands of the heathen. If God has already remembered His covenant, or, which is the same thing, fulfilled it, particularly by giving them the land of the heathen, it is not still to be fulfilled: and particularly, it is not yet to be fulfilled to *Abraham* and his faithful seed by a resurrection at the restitution of all things. I find, since this difficulty has occurred to me, that it was observed by Archbishop Usher.

The difficulty, I confess, seems unanswerable, if the reading and version be true. But one would think that it ran in the best copies of the original in the imperative mood, or in the subjunctive plural, and not in the third person singular of the preterperfect of the indicative:

since all the preceding verses are in the imperative. V. 1—6, "O give thanks, sing unto Him: sing psalms unto Him. Glory ye in His holy name. Seek the Lord and His strength; seek His face evermore. Remember His marvellous works that He hath done." And then, as I think, one should naturally suppose it to have been in the best copies of the original, REMEMBER *His covenant for ever,* v. 8; and not as we now read it, HE HATH *remembered,* &c. Agreeably, here, to the copies, read it in the subjunctive mood, (and so the LXX have rendered it,) 1 Chron. xvi. 15, LET US REMEMBER; which comes to the same thing as if it had been said, REMEMBER. And the *Psalm,* as it lies there, goes on in the imperative mood, in several of the verses that follow the 15th verse, as well as in several that precede it. Thus, "*Sing* unto the Lord all the earth. Shew forth His salvation," v. 24. "Declare His glory among the heathen," v. 25. "Give unto the Lord ye kindreds of the people; give unto the Lord glory and strength," v. 28. "Give unto the Lord the glory due unto His name: bring an offering, and come before Him: worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness," v. 29. "Fear before Him all the earth," v. 30. "O give thanks unto the Lord," v. 34. "And say ye," v. 35. These verses may be met with, Psalm cv. 8, and not as our copies and bibles have it, HE HATH REMEMBERED. And after all, I sup-

pose the plural reading may be justly *rendered*, *He* REMEMBERS *His covenant* ALWAYS; and that reading entirely removes the objection.

SECTION VII.—*The theory respecting the paradisaical state farther confirmed from several passages in the Apocalypse of St. John, with some observations respecting that book.*

After stating this fresh objection and answer, give me leave to add a farther observation, that has also occurred to me since my last, and which I think is a very great confirmation of all I have troubled you with about the paradisaical state: I mean the state which is to take place on the new earth at the restitution of all things; which, as St. Peter says, God has foretold by the mouth of all His holy prophets since the world began: my observation arises from the rewards, which the Spirit promises to the seven churches of *Asia*. Those rewards, I dare say, you will readily allow, must be either paradisaical or celestial. I do not see how they can by any rules of language be possibly thought to be celestial rewards; though I own they have been quoted often by the greatest men to that purpose. They must therefore be paradisaical; and such I think they will appear to be on considering each of them. Thus, Rev. ii. 7, *To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the*

tree of life, that grows in the midst of the paradise of God. This tree of life is said to be *in the midst of the city,* viz. of the *new Jerusalem,* Rev. xxii. 2, *which cometh down from heaven on the earth,* Rev. xxi. 1, 2. This reward is too express to my purpose to want any thing more to be said upon it. Thus, Rev. ii. 11, *he that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death.* This promise must take place before the end of Christ's reign, and consequently in the paradisaical state: for at the end of the general judgment, and before the celestial state begins, death and *hades* are to be destroyed, *by being cast into the lake of fire and brimstone,* Rev. xx. 14; and consequently after that cannot hurt any one. So that to make this promise a promise of any consequence, it must be supposed to refer to the paradisaical state, and not to the celestial. Thus, Rev. ii. 26, *To him that overcometh will I give power over the nations, and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessel of a potter shall they be broken to pieces.* This sure must be in the paradisaical state, when there will be nations that may be broken. But not in heaven, where all civil communities of men will be dissolved, and nations shall be no more. Thus, Rev. iii. 5, *He that overcometh shall walk,* &c. *And I will not blot out his name out of the book of life, but will confess his name before my Father, and before His angels.* This cannot relate

to the heavenly state, since that succeeds the judgment; and consequently must relate to the paradisaical state that precedes the judgment, and ends immediately after it. Thus, v. 12, *Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God: and I will write upon him the name of the new Jerusalem, which cometh down from heaven* [viz. on the new earth], Rev. xxi. 1, 2. Thus, v. 21, *To him that overcometh will I give to sit down on my throne,* &c. Christ will continue to have a throne in the paradisaical state. It is the glorious state of His kingdom, described Dan. vii. But after that this glorious state of it shall be at an end, *and He is to deliver up the kingdom to the Father, that God may be all in all.* I confess I do not well understand the reward promised, Rev. ii. 17. But yet *to eat of the hidden manna* looks more like the paradisaical state than the celestial, where there is to be no eating nor drinking, but we are to be like the angels which are in heaven.

After saying this on the reward, that is promised to each of the seven churches in particular, I will trouble you with two general observations on the book of *Revelations,* by which I imagine you will be more strongly induced to think that these rewards are *paradisaical,* and not *celestial:* the first is this: the *Apocalypse* is said to be *the revelation which God gave unto Jesus Christ,* and which He signified by His

angel to His servant *John.* The manner of this revelation being made to Christ is represented in the fifth chapter by the Lamb's taking the seven sealed book out of the hand of Him that sat upon the throne, and opening the seals thereof. God had hitherto *reserved the times and seasons in His own hand:* now He reveals them to *Jesus Christ;* and, as one would naturally suppose, in order to His administering that kingdom the better that was put into His hands. This is probably what *St. Paul* partly designed by telling us, *that all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are hid in Christ,* Coloss. ii. 3; and that God anointed Christ *with the oil of gladness above His fellows,* Heb. i. 9. This *revelation* (called also treasures of wisdom, and knowledge, and a superior unction by St. Paul) —this revelation, I say, Christ sends, and signifies by His *angel to His servant John.* One would think, then, that all that is foretold in this book should end with His kingdom, to the better administering of which it seems to have been given Him. And there in fact it seems to end. For the last prophecy is of *death* and *hades'* being *cast into the lake of fire,* Rev. xx. 14. All that is said of the new heavens, and new earth, and the new *Jerusalem,* is in time before it; being a description of the state of things in the *Millennium,* before death and *hades'* being destroyed; though, according to the usual method of this

book, what is said of the new heaven, &c. is in place after it; as I observed in a former letter.

I must yet add one observation more. The *Apocalypse* is divided into *the things which John had seen, which are, and which shall be hereafter*, Rev. i. 19. The things which *John* had seen, are the vision of the first chapter; the things which are, are the epistles to the seven churches, contained in the 2d and 3d chapters: these are manifestly within the times of Christ's kingdom. *The things that shall be,* are those contained in the rest of the book; and I should think they also should be within the times of Christ's kingdom, as well as the two former, which are evidently within that period. Besides, several of these rewards agree with the state of things that is more particularly described in the xxth, xxist, and xxiid of the *Revelation,* which undoubtedly contain a description of the paradisaical state. They must needs then be paradisaical rewards.

SECTION VIII.—*On the descent of Christ into hades.*

"If our blessed *Saviour* had been a man, as we are, consisting of soul and body, as we are supposed to do," I own with you, there could not have been the least difficulty in supposing His soul to have gone to *hades* at the time of His death, and to have been in a state of uncon-

sciousness. But then, you know, there would have been another insuperable difficulty, viz. that has been always urged against *Nestorius;* since, in that case, our blessed *Saviour* must have been two Saviours, or two persons, and not one; consisting of one body and two principles of intelligence and agency, (namely, the Logos and the soul,) to act it; or, at least, the Logos could not be united to the body of Christ.

SECTION IX.—*On the humiliation and exaltation of Christ.*

It must be owned that there is a difficulty, at first sight, in supposing so high a Being as the *Logos* to have humbled Himself in any one of the instances which the *Scripture* gives us an account of. It may seem amazing to us, that the first, and only immediately derived Being, by whom God made the worlds, and still upholds them; who is consequently the bright effulgence of the Father's glory, and the express character of His person; and who was in the form of God; should empty Himself of His dignity and glory; take a human body; lie in the Virgin's womb; submit to all the laws of infancy and childhood, without more perception than an animal; afterwards grow in wisdom and stature as a child; not only feel the

common infirmities of our nature, but be a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief; be spit upon, buffeted, insulted, crucified, and buried; all this, I say, will seem astonishing at the first view: but then let it be considered that all this was in order to promote the glory of God and the happiness of man, and in order to His own highest exaltation and advancement; He being thereupon to receive a name above every name, till there shall be no name but that of God, even the Father only; that so God may be all in all. And when Christ's humiliation is placed in this light, what is there in all His exinanition, and abasement, that should seem to clash with any rule of wisdom, or proportion, that is in the least unfit for the only underived Being to propose, or for the only immediately derived Being to comply with, especially considering Him capable of a reward? what more proper than this, to give the highest instance of humility to all the subjects of God's vast and extended empire, and thereby to preserve them from pride, the snare and condemnation of the devil? Since they are hereby all taught in the highest instance, and consequently in the most effectual manner, that the true way to honour and advancement, is to think no condescension too mean by which glory can redound to God, or happiness to others, or ourselves.

And if it was not the *Logos* that took a body,

and lay in the womb; that was subject to the laws of childhood and humanity; and that underwent all those infirmities, reproaches, and sufferings, which the Scriptures mention Christ to have undergone, how was the *Logos* humbled at all? or in what did His humiliation consist? All these instances in any other case could not have been the humiliation of the *Logos*. The soul that animated the body of *Jesus* might indeed be made subject to all this low state, but could not for that reason be said to be emptied or humbled. Or if, fancying His soul to have been pre-existent, (for that is sure a groundless conceit,) we suppose it to have been emptied and humbled, Jesus may be said to have been emptied, or humbled, but not the *Logos;* and we shall fall into an heresy, like that of *Cerinthus;* and hold, that *Jesus* was emptied and humbled, but that the *Logos*, or Christ, was no ways affected thereby.

Nor can I see, on the other hand, if the *Logos* was in a state of unconsciousness for about eight and thirty, or forty hours, at the time of His death, that the *Logos* was in a lower state of abasement, in that instance, than in many others which have been mentioned. Sure it is much less to be in a state without perception and ideas, for eight and thirty, or forty hours, than to have been in a state without ideas, and of bare perception only, for a great many

months; which must have been the case of the Infant *Word.*

SECTION X.—*Observations on Dr. Lardner's vindication of the truth of certain miracles against the objections of Woolston.*

I read the *vindication of the miracles,* which our blessed Saviour wrought on *Jairus'* daughter, the *widow of Nain's son,* and *Lazarus,* soon after you had made me that kind present. I take this opportunity to return you my best thanks for it. In the preface you have managed an argument for free writing, that seemed to be quite exhausted, with a beautiful turn, that is peculiar, and that cannot fail to strike your reader. You have done justice to Christianity, and honour to the dissenters, by the sentiments you profess in that preface. You have shown a very masterly knowledge of the *gospels* throughout your whole performance. Allow me at the same time to say, that you have omitted no circumstance that occurs in any of them to support the three miracles you defend, or to answer what *Mr. Woolston* has alleged to prove them impostures, without straining any thing, either to support the miracles, or to lay open the injustice of *Mr. Woolston's* cavils. And every one must allow that you have done this with

the simplicity in which the histories of these miracles themselves are writ, and in the spirit of the author of them: I mean the greatest modesty and temper imaginable. So that I do not at all wonder to hear that *Mr. Woolston* seems more touched himself, and more urged by his friends with what you say against him, than with any other of the many ingenious and learned answers that have appeared.

SECTION XI.—*On the raising of Jairus' daughter; whether the miracle consisted in healing, or in restoration to life?*

However, I will freely own to you, that I apprehend the recovery of *Jairus'* daughter to have been a miracle of a great, instantaneous, and perfect cure, rather than of a resurrection. I will give you the reasons that induce me to think so; submitting them to you with the deference that is due to one who has considered these three miracles so carefully.

1. There is not that conclusive evidence, from the circumstance of the case, that *Jairus'* daughter was dead, as there is in the case of the *widow* of *Nain's* son, or of *Lazarus*. The *widow* of *Nain's* son was carrying to his grave: *Lazarus* had been dead four days, and had been, it may be, three of them in his tomb: *Jairus'* daughter might not have been thought

dead many hours. *Jairus* probably was the ruler of a synagogue at *Capernaum*. Our Saviour had crossed the sea of *Tiberias*, and had come to the other side; that is, the side opposite to *Gadara*, and consequently near to Capernaum; but staid near the sea; perhaps but a few furlongs from the city. There Jairus comes to Him, and thence our Saviour accompanies him to his house, though very leisurely. All this might not take up above two or three hours' time. And though it is very true, as you observe, that when persons are supposed to be dead, that are not, it is generally in sudden distempers, and not after a lingering one; yet even such cases sometimes happen. And it is not so sure that the case of Jairus' daughter was a lingering case. It might not have lasted many hours for what appears. She might seem at the point of death to her father, from some sudden and violent distemper.

2. The word that *St. Luke* reports our *Saviour* to have used, when He tells *Jairus* in the way to his house what He will do for his daughter, is a word of healing. When *one told Jairus, Thy daughter is dead; trouble not the Master;* our *Saviour* says, *Fear not; believe only, and she shall be* MADE WHOLE, σωθήσεται, Luke viii. 49, 50. This word is used by *Jairus* when, as another evangelist relates it, he came to *Jesus*, to desire Him, that He would come and *lay*

hands on her, that she MIGHT BE HEALED, *and live,* ὅπως σωθῇ καὶ ζήσεται, Mark v. 23. And this is the word that is often made use of for Christ's and His apostles' healing the sick. Now our *Saviour's* using this word shows plainly, that, when news was brought to the ruler that she was dead, Christ did not think her dead. If Christ, thinking her dead, had resolved to restore her, He would have said; "Fear not; I will raise her;" or, "She shall rise again," [ἀναστήσεται,] as He says in the case of *Lazarus*, John xi. 23. But sure He would never have said, I will heal her, or make her whole. The word σωθήσεται relates to healing a person that is sick, but can never be properly used to signify the raising up one that is dead. It would have been as improper for our *Saviour* to have said, I will heal the dead, or make the dead whole, as to have said, I will unstop the eyes of the blind, or open the feet of the lame.

3. The word that the three *evangelists* report our *Saviour* to have used, in what He asserts about the state of *Jairus'* daughter, when He came into his house, is καθεύδει; which always signifies to sleep in the nineteen other places of the *New Testament* where it is used. It never signifies to sleep the sleep of death once; unless it should be thought to do so in the three evangelists, which give us the account

of Jairus' daughter. Whereas the words that are used about the widow of *Nain's* son are, τεθνηκὼς and νεκρὸς: words subject to no ambiguity: and the word that our *Saviour* uses about *Lazarus* is κεκοίμηται. Κοιμάομαι is used in eighteen places of the New Testament; and in fifteen of them it signifies death; and in the other three, indeed, natural sleep. From these words having sometimes the latter sense, the disciples misunderstood our Saviour when He said Λάζαρος κεκοίμηται: thinking that He [Christ] meant that *Lazarus* was in a natural sleep. What induced them the rather to understand κεκοίμηται in this sense was, that they had only then heard that he was sick, and had heard our *Saviour* say, *This sickness is* NOT UNTO DEATH, *but for the glory of God.* But then, to remove all ambiguity, our *Saviour* explains Himself by a word that is of a determinate signification, and says, Λάζαρος ἀπέθανε. The words therefore that are used about the widow of *Nain's* son, and *Lazarus*, being words that signify death, and the word that is used about *Jairus'* daughter never signifying death, in any other place of the New Testament, makes her case quite different from the other two.

4. But there is yet a stronger reason to induce us to think that *Jairus'* daughter was not dead. For our *Saviour* says, οὐκ ἀπέθανεν, ἀλλὰ καθεύδει, *she is not dead, but sleepeth.* This

makes the assertion the most positive that can be; it being expressed negatively as well as positively. And it is remarkable, that the word [ἀπέθανε] that our Saviour uses in the negative form of speech is the very same word that He uses in the case of *Lazarus*, when He would let His disciples know that *Lazarus* was dead, by removing the ambiguity of the word [κεκοίμηται] that was not so liable to be understood of sleep, as the word He uses of *Jairus*' daughter, when He says of her, καθεύδει.

You are very much in the right to insist on what our *Saviour* said in the case of *Lazarus*, when He was told that *Lazarus* was sick. It is the strength of what can be said in reply to this fourth reason against supposing *Jairus*' daughter to be dead. But I think when our *Saviour* says, on the news of *Lazarus*' sickness, that *this sickness* IS NOT *unto death*, it is the same thing as if He had said, IT SHALL NOT BE unto death; meaning such a death as men commonly undergo, from which there is no recovery till the general resurrection. This might have been the sense if nothing farther had been added; but words and circumstances that follow in *Lazarus*' case force us into that sense of them, as the only sense they will bear. But there are no such words or circumstances in the case of Jairus' daughter that should make us depart from the literal and usual

signification of so strong an expression, and which is to be understood as it is expressed, in the present tense, *she is not dead, but sleepeth.*

5. That which I think adds force to all that has gone before is, that our *Saviour* says these words as a reason why they should not go on with the lamentations that they were making, and which seem to have been but such as were usual on the like occasion with that which they supposed this to be. Our *Saviour* does not seem to reprove these lamentations as wicked and immoral; but as foolish, and besides the purpose: For *when He saw the people, the multitude, and the minstrels* [all] *making a noise, the tumult, and them that wept and wailed greatly, He saith unto them* (as soon as He comes into the house), *Why make ye this ado, and weep? Give place, for the maid* IS NOT DEAD, BUT SLEEPETH. "Be gone, for their is no occasion for you. You mistake the case; the maid is not dead, as you suppose, but sleepeth; that is, under the power of a violent disease, from which I am going in an instant to restore her." Our *Saviour* is so far from reproving the grief, that was expressed in the two other cases, that He bears a part in it.

6. There is a circumstance or two still behind, that incline me to think that *Jairus'* daughter was not dead; and the last of them as much as any of the rest. The first is, that

our *Saviour takes her by the hand*, before He says, *Maid, arise*. To be sure there was the greatest propriety in every action of our *Saviour*. Each action was perfectly well suited to every circumstance of the case. Now it seems to me that the taking her by the hand, is not an action suited to raise one that was dead, absolutely, and totally incapable to help herself (as you must suppose her to have been before the word *Arise* was spoken by our *Saviour*), but to assist one that had some life, and some sort of strength left in her. We read indeed of *Peter's* taking a lame man by the hand, to raise him up: but it was after he had bid him, *Rise up, and walk*, Acts iii. 6, 7. By which words he had restored him from his lameness, and given him strength. We read also of *Peter's* giving *Dorcas* his hand, to raise her up, Acts ix. 42; but it was after he had bid her *arise*, and she had opened her eyes, and had sat up. But we do not read of any such action preceding the command *to arise*, in the case of the other two resurrection miracles.

The other circumstance is, that when she arose, and walked, our *Saviour* ordered that *some meat should be set before her*. This seems to me to be done on purpose to show that she was recovered to perfect health from sickness, and not to life from death; in order to point out to them wherein the miracle that He had wrought

consisted, and to prevent any mistake about it. It seems to me to have been altogether unnecessary to have ordered meat to be set before her, to show that she was alive. Life appeared a thousand other ways: strength also appeared in her walking. But perfect health could appear no way so well, as if she fell to eating, on meats being set before her: whereas the other two cases, being a recovery from death, no such order is given by our *Saviour;* it not serving to the purpose of showing a person to be brought to life that had been dead; though nothing could so well show a perfect, as well as an instantaneous recovery from the force of a violent distemper.

These are the reasons why I differ from you in an opinion which has had all the *critics* and *commentators* on its side, and which is yet better supported by you than it has ever been by any other writer. Be so good to me, if you can, as to help me over difficulties which make me singular in this point.

I am, Reverend Sir,

your most faithful,

humble servant,

BARRINGTON.

TEXTS OF SCRIPTURE

Explained, Paraphrased, or otherwise illustrated.

	Vol.	Page.
Gen. i. 26. 28.	iii.	146
iii. 15.	—	153
— 22.	ii.	409
v. 3.	—	421
	iii.	147
viii. 21, 22.	ii.	471
ix.	—	477
xii. 1—8.	iii.	61
xiii. 14—19.	—	66
xv.	—	69
xvi. 15, 16.	—	76
xvii. 1—21.	—	77
— 7, 8.	—	159. 182
xviii. 1, 2. 9, 10. 17, 18.	—	90
xxi.	—	92
xxii. 15—19.	—	94
xxxi. 54.	—	49
xxxv. 14.	—	*ibid.*
xlix. 30.	—	197
Exod. xxxii. 18.	—	31
Psal. xxxii.	—	218
xlix.	—	219
lxxiii.	—	239
lxxviii. 18.	i.	97
Prov. iii. 18.	iii.	220
Dan. xii.	—	221
Isai. xi. 4.	—	35
lv. 3.	—	213
Luke i. 54, 55.	—	201
iii. 10.	i.	159
xxiii. 43.	iii.	275
John iii. 5—7.	i.	160
vii. 35.	ii.	115
— 39.	i.	137
ix. 7.	—	157
xvi. 8.	—	251
Acts i. 2.	ii.	31
— 5.	i.	160
ii. 19—27.	ii.	193
— 15—39.	i.	238
iii. 21.	iii.	229
ix. 22.	ii.	234
xi. 20.	iii.	213
xv. 9.	i.	112

	Vol.	Page.
Acts xv. 10.	ii.	178
— 40.	—	301
xvi. 4.	—	177
— 4, 5.	—	300
xviii. 24—27.	—	60
xxii. 14.	—	189
xxiii. 1.	—	82
Rom. viii. 23.	i.	117
xii. 8.	—	61
xv. 16.	—	133
1 Cor. ii. 15.	—	42
xi. 3—17.	—	46
xii. 1.	—	70
xiv. 16.	—	45
— 26.	—	39
xv. 24—28.	iii.	43
2 Cor. ix. 2.	i.	80
xii. 1.	ii.	202
Gal. ii. 2.	—	311
iii. 16.	iii.	99
vi. 1.	i.	42
Ephes. i. 3.	—	100
iv. 8.	—	15
— 12—17.	—	167
Col. iii. 16.	—	40
1 Thess. iv. 13—18.	iii.	168
v. 12.	i.	62. 83. 87
2 Thess. ii. 14.	ii.	122
1 Tim. iii. 2.	i.	52
— 13.	—	61
iv. 14.	ii.	87
2 Tim. i. 6.	i.	209
Titus iii. 5, 6.	ii.	80
Philemon 9.	—	153
Heb. i. 9.	i.	113
xi. 8.	iii.	181. 206
xii. 22—25.	—	111
xiii. 2—17.	i.	80
James v. 14, 15.	—	157
1 Peter i. 12—20.	ii.	108
iii. 17—22.	iii.	53
iv. 10, 11.	i.	241
2 Peter iii. 13.	iii.	230
Rev. xxi. 7.	—	126
— 8.	—	173
— 22—27.	—	233

INDEX.

Abel, remarks on his sacrifice, ii. 441. iii. 19. why accepted by God, ii. 442—447.

Abraham, remarks on his teaching and travels, i. 7. "children of Abraham," extensive application of the expression, ii. 516. the calling and blessing of him, 483. 489. "God of Abraham," meaning of the expression, 505. meaning of, "I will be thy God," 497. 503. iii. 177. of the inheritance promised to him, 508. sacrifices probably not offered by him, 44. hoped to possess Canaan for ever, 175. 193. in what sense God promised "to multiply him exceedingly," 182. the promise of Canaan plainly implies his resurrection, 185. the terms of the promise confine the possession of Canaan to the spiritual seed only, 187. enumeration of the covenants with him, 191. his conduct in reference to the sacrifice of Isaac indicated his belief in a resurrection, 198. the covenants with Abraham and David compared, 215. 226.

Adam, the rules of conduct which he might have collected, in a state of innocence, without the aid of revelation, ii. 387. in what sense he is said to have been "the son of God," (Luke iii. 38.) ii. 394. supposed to have been clothed with a glory before the fall, 399. iii. 265. why the animals were brought before him in pairs, 3.

Allegories and metaphors in Scripture need a key to open the sense that is couched under them, ii. 377.

Altars, erected by the postdiluvian patriarchs were not used for the purpose of sacrifice, iii. 49.

Ambassador, why St. Paul calls himself one, ii. 18, 19.

Amos, meaning of the passage cited from him by James in the apostolical council, ii. 294.

Ananias, the reasons why St. Peter struck him and Sapphira dead, ii. 66.

Ananias, Paul did not receive the Holy Ghost by the laying on of his hands, ii. 189.

Angel of God's presence, who, i. 6. iii. 24.

Angels, the illumination of the Holy Ghost could not be conveyed by any of them, i. 322.

Antediluvians, nature of the hope of immortality entertained by them, ii. 451. particularly from the translation of Enoch, 455. 500.

Antioch, the church of, in Syria, consisted chiefly of proselytes of the gate, ii. 114. 280. sent its alms to Christian not to Jewish elders, 142. why it sent for advice to Jerusalem, 174. its peculiar fitness to be the next church in importance to the church at Jerusalem, 287.

Antioch, in Pisidia, St. Paul first preaches to the idolatrous Gentiles there, ii. 200.

Apocalypse, remarks on the order of the visions in that book, iii. 230.

Apostle, definition of the term, ii. 15.

Apostles, always appeal to facts as the foundation of Christianity, i. 29. would not have proceeded to publish the gospel without assistance from on high, 181—199. state of the church in their time, ii. 2. their first commission terminated after a short time, 8. their second commission, 10. began to execute their commission for life on the day of Pentecost, 13. the most distinguishing part of their character, what, 19. the terms of their last commission general, why, 20. they alone testified the resurrection of Christ, 27, 28. the apostles' company, what, 37. their peculiar boldness, one of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, ii. 58. power of punishing offenders with instant death peculiar to them, 64. power of performing extraordinary cures 67. and of conferring miraculous gifts, 68. their power of "conferring the Holy Spirit" the peculiar gift of the apos-

tles as witnesses, 72. importance of their office, 95. necessary that they should have seen the Lord, 102. two divisions of the apostleship, 105. the twelve, the apostles of the Jews only, Paul and Barnabas, the apostles of the Gentiles only, 106. on their temper and dispositions, 128. probable reasons why only twelve apostles were first appointed, 129. on their condition and manner of life, 130. 132. why two learned men were afterwards chosen, 133.

Apostolical decree, observations on it, ii. 265. only related to such as became converts from having been proselytes of the gate, 267. 280. 293. and to them only while the Jewish polity lasted, *ibid.* not intended for proselytes of the gate, 272. reason of the order of the terms in the prohibition, 305, 306. what the question was which caused the decree, 313. the conversion of the idolatrous Gentiles not known at Jerusalem at the time of the decree, 314. objections to the author's interpretation considered, 322.

Arabia, probable reason why St. Paul preached there immediately after his conversion, ii. 233.

Ark of Noah, that God vouchsafed a visible indication of His residence in it during the flood, iii. 22.

Asaph, Psalm of, (lxxiii.) considerations respecting it, iii. 239.

Ascension and Pentecost, causes of the interval between them, i. 134.

Authors, what qualifications they should have, i. 65, 66.

Babel, tower of, probable object of building it, ii. 479.

Baptism, nature of the rite appointed by our Lord before His death, ii. 4. "baptism now saveth us," meaning of these words, iii. 57.

Barnabas, chosen with Paul to testify the resurrection of Christ, ii. 30. likely that he was one of the Seventy, 36.

import of the name, 37. 39, 40. probably the same as Barsabas, *ibid.* always named before St. Paul by Luke, till after St. Paul's second visit to Jerusalem, why, 247.

Barrington, Lord, in early life the friend of Mr. Locke, *note*, i. 51.

Barsabas, probably the same as Barnabas, ii. 37.

"Being put to death in the flesh," meaning of these words, *note*, iii. 53.

Bible, great leisure, care, and ability necessary to arrive at the true sense of it, ii. 370, 371. advantages of a critical study of it, *ibid.*

"Blood," meaning of the word in the apostolical decree, ii. 269.

"Brethren," a name of all disciples who were not apostles or elders, ii. 168.

"But to seed, as of one, which is Christ," Gal. iii. 16. meaning of these words, iii. 99—110.

Cain, enmity put between his family and the family of Seth, 437. observations on God's words to him, Gen. iv. "If thou doest well," 444. why his offering was rejected, *ibid.* and 447—449. brought his offering to the place of the visible presence of Jehovah, iii. 19.

Calvin, defended Episcopacy, *note*, ii. 161.

Canaan, the promise of an everlasting possession of it implied a future life, 508—516. an everlasting possession of it expected by Abraham, iii. 177.

Caraites, their mode of interpretation commended, 144.

Celsus, answer to one of his objections against Christianity, ii. 99.

Χάρις, meaning of the word in the Scripture, i. 42. meaning of the word in Col. iii. 16.

Circumcision, design of the rite, ii. 521—524. nature of the covenant of it, iii. 86. 284.

City, the emblem of one often used in Scripture to denote a future life, ii. 514.

Christ, observations on His divine nature, i. 11. and on His effusion of the Holy Spirit, 13. on His teaching while on earth, 19. probably born at the feast of tabernacles, 137. promises the gift of the Holy Ghost at the feast of tabernacles, 158. the Holy Ghost did not descend on Him at His baptism, till after His coming out of the water, 166. the Holy Spirit rested upon Him without measure, 228. reason why He appealed to prophecy, 251. nature of the baptism appointed by Him during His life, ii. 4. *the rod of His power*, meaning of, 70. why He appeared to a few only after His resurrection, 98. true force of His argument against the Sadducees, 503—506. Christ is to be understood by "the visible presence of God," in the Old Testament, iii. 23. "preached to the spirits in prison," meaning of these words, *note*, 54.

Christianity, what, ii. 91. could not have been established without miraculous assistance, i. 180. founded on facts, 249. order in which God ordained it to be preached, 232. in the apostolic age did not alter the civil duties of those who embraced it, 330, 331. a rational and consistent view of it the best cure of deism, 376.

Christian, origin and meaning of the word, ii. 285, 286.

Church, state of it at the time of the apostles, ii. 2. denoted by the word "Christ," in Gal. iii. 16., 520, 521.

Church of England, the good effects of its conduct towards the enemies of Christianity, i. 247.

Clarke, Dr., his definition of a miracle, i. 232. mistaken in his explanation of a passage in the epistle to the Hebrews, iii. 133.

Clemens Romanus, his testimony to the gifts of the Holy Ghost in his time, i. 221.

Clergy, the state they were in at the time of the Reformation, i. 192.

Cloud of glory, considerations on it, iii. 37.

Coats of skins, design of them, ii. 440.

Confusion of tongues, extent of it, ii. 480.
Conscience, the instrument by which God appeals to all men since the fall, i. 3. remark on it by St. Paul, *ibid.*
Corinthian church, character of it, ii. 76. denoted in the epistle to the Galatians by the term "Christ," 520.
Cornelius, on his being filled with the Holy Ghost, i. 116. 128. he and his family the first fruits of the proselytes of the gate, ii. 112.

Daniel, book of, inferences from it concerning the resurrection, iii. 225.
"David, the sure mercies of," meaning of the expression, 213. the covenants with David and Abraham compared, 214. 226.
"Deacons," in the Christian church, probably the same as those who were called "helps," i. 54. nature of their office, 55—57.
Deism, observations on its prevalence, ii. 361, 362. what disposes men to it, 372. 374. a rational view of, 376. Christianity the best cure of it, *ibid.*
Deluge, causes of it, ii. 462.
"Discerning of spirits," observations on the gift, i. 35.
Disciples, the one hundred and twenty, remarkable providence concerning them, ii. 55.

Eden, hopes of a restoration to it conceived by the antediluvians from its preservation, ii. 440.
Elders, under the gospel dispensation, could not confer the Holy Spirit by the laying on of hands, ii. 88. meaning of the name, 140. held the next rank to the apostles, 143. the first teachers next to the apostles selected from them, to succeed in government of the churches, ii. 144. analogy between them and the officers chosen by Moses, 145. elders among Christians were the earliest converts, 146. their privileges, 148—150. difference between the αὐτόπται, ἀπαρχαὶ, and πρώτη διαδοχὴ, 150, 151.

Ἕλλῆνες, Gentiles, the word most opposed to it in the Acts of the Apostles is Ἰουδαῖοι, 282. sometimes signifies proselytes of the gate, 326.
Ἑλλήνισται, is opposed to Ἑβραῖοι, 282.
Enoch, hopes conceived by the antediluvians of a restoration to paradise, from his translation, ii. 439. 455, 456. remark on his translation, *ibid.* and 457—461. 500.
Episcopacy, the original church government, ii. 159.
Eusebius, his testimony concerning the cessation of the miraculous gifts in his time, i. 222.
"Evangelists," their character, 57—61.
Eve, probable nature of the curse pronounced upon her, ii. 486. iii. 11. why so named by Adam, 13.

Facts, arguments from of greater weight than from prophecy, i. 252.
Faculties, natural, not the only inlet to the knowledge of divine things, ii. 363.
Fall of Adam, consequences of it, 419. remedies of it, 434.
Fall of man, observations on Moses' account of it, iii. 1.
Father, when applied to God, in the Scriptures, import of the term, ii. 393. 454. 499. 502.
"Filled with the Holy Ghost," meaning of these words, i. 114. different from receiving the Holy Ghost, 164.
Foreknowledge of future events, a faculty imparted to the prophets who held the next rank to the apostles, i. 32.
"Form of God," meaning of the expression, iii. 267.
Future state, the opinions of the patriarchs and prophets concerning it, iii. 142.
Genesis, book of, importance of it, iii. 262.
Gentiles, the word Ἕλλῆνας properly so translated, ii. 281. opinion of the Jews with respect to them, i. 172. their equality with the Jews demonstrated by the miraculous gifts, 174.
Gifts, miraculous, the exercise of them subjected to the

heads of the Churches, i. 86. circumstances common to all of them, 92. why called gifts, 97. 100. might be, and frequently were abused, 98. conferred upon all believers in the early churches, 163. their analogy with the ordinary faculties of the mind, 175. on the duration of them, 221. in what their manifestation and influence consisted, 225. effects of them upon the minds of the receivers, 228, 229.

"God's visible presence," observations on, iii. 19. 41—43. meaning of the expression, 23. inferences from the circumstance, 43. meaning of the word "God" in the Pentateuch, 158.

"Governments," κυβερνήσεις, persons so called, nature of their office, i. 61. real import of the term, what, 69. terms supposed to be synonymous with it, 78.

"Heal the lepers," remark on these words, ii. 5.

Healing, power of, different from the gifts of the Spirit, i. 105.

Heaven, not distinctly promised till after the ascension of our Lord, iii. 279.

Hebrews vi. 2. explanation of this passage, i. 140. explanation of xii., 22—25., iii. 111.

"Helps," probably the same as deacons, i. 54. nature of their office, 57—61.

"Hellenist Jews," who, ii. 106. 284.

Holy Spirit, the, the last and greatest proof of the Christian religion, i. 1. the New Testament cannot be clearly understood without carefully considering it, 2. more extensive and efficacious effusion of it after the Ascension, 13—16. on the teaching and witness of it, 19. not given under the law, how, 96. visible descent of it only permitted on rare and important occasions, 117. remarks on its effusion on "the hundred and twenty," 119—122. effusion of it on Saul, and on the proselytes of the gate, *ibid.* 123. the last visible descent of it was on the idolatrous Gentiles,

124. imparted to the Samaritans by the laying on of hands, 129—134. probable reason why it was not given *immediately* after the Ascension, 134—140. observations on the giving of it by the "laying on of hands," 140. 164. imparted at baptism, 144. promised by Christ on "the last day of the feast" of tabernacles, 157. design and objects of the witnessing of the Holy Spirit, 169. 178. the bestowing of these gifts much insisted on in Scripture, 170, 171. in what the manifestation and effects of its miraculous influences consisted, 225. rested upon Christ without measure, 228. sin against it, what, 245. on whom it was poured out in the time of the apostles, ii. 151.

Jacob, probably did not offer sacrifices, iii. 44—48.

James, writes to the twelve tribes, ii. 106. president at Jerusalem after the dispersion, 128. the passage cited by him from Amos explained, 294, 295. his argument in the council at Jerusalem could only apply to the proselytes of the gate, ii. 296, 297. his argument paraphrased, *ibid.*

"Idols, things offered to," what, ii. 269.

"Jehovah, the face of," observations on these words, 437. the Angel Jehovah visible among men before the deluge, 438. probably resided at the entrance of Eden, *ibid.* iii. 26. implies the second person in the Blessed Trinity, 24, 25.

Jerusalem, decision of the council of, ii. 176. remarks on the decree, 177—180.

Ignatius, his testimony to the existence of the gifts of the Holy Spirit in his time, i. 222.

"In his likeness, after his image," meaning of, ii. 421.

Inns, not common at the commencement of the Christian era, i. 79.

Interpretation of any word in Scripture, conditions of a just one, what, i. 69.

"Interpretation of tongues," nature of the gift, i. 48.

John the Baptist, the spirit of prophecy revives in him, i. 8. his character, 9, 10.

John, St., his epistles to the seven churches in Asia, addressed to believing Jews, ii. 116. these epistles not to be understood in a mystical sense, *ibid.*

Irenæus, his testimony to the existence of the miraculous gifts in his time, i. 222.

Isaac, probably did not offer sacrifices, iii. 44. observations on the promise to him, 89.

Israel, why called the first-born, ii. 526.

Israelites, revelations of God to them, i. 6. effect of their knowledge and conduct on the Gentiles, 7. their opinions with respect to the Gentiles, 172.

"It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us," meaning of these words, ii. 303.

"It shall bruise thy head," meaning of this expression, ii. 429.

Jews, revelation of God to them, i. 6. effect of their knowledge and conduct on the Gentiles, 7. state of religion among them at the coming of Christ, 9. opinions entertained by them with respect to the Gentiles, 172.

Jupiter, the fables concerning the visits to men by him and other gods derived from the Scriptural accounts of God's visible presence, iii. 51.

Justin Martyr, his testimony concerning miraculous gifts, i. 222.

Jairus' daughter, inquiry concerning her miraculous restoration, iii. 348.

"Kingdom of heaven," meaning of, ii. 3.

"Knowledge, the word of," the gift of it constituted a prophet of the highest rank, i. 31.

"Knowing good and evil," meaning of this expression, ii. 400.

Language, probably revealed to our first parents, ii. 406.

"Laying on of hands," (Heb. vi. 2.) meaning of these words, i. 140. 164. ii. 257. not a peculiar circumstance of ordination, 258.

Lawyers, mode of reasoning used by them the best for theologians, iii. 271.

Lazarus, inferences from his restoration to life, iii. 165.

"Lest by any means he should run in vain," meaning of these words, ii. 315.

Leviticus xvii. chapter, paraphrased, ii. 345.

Life, a future one, often denoted in Scripture under the emblem of a city, ii. 514.

Leprosy, the opinion of the Jews respecting this disease, ii. 5.

"Likeness of God," meaning of this expression, iii. 145. 268.

Luke, St., on an expression of his concerning Paul and Barnabas, i. 129.

Luther, defends episcopacy, *note*, ii. 161.

Lystra, St. Paul first preaches the gospel there to heathens only, ii. 215.

Machpelah, the cave of, Abraham's purchase of it for a burial place implied his expectation of an everlasting possession of Canaan, iii. 197.

Maimonides, his paraphrase of a passage in Leviticus xvii., *note*, ii. 346. 355.

Mark, mutual attachment between him and St. Peter, ii. 141.

Mary, the blessed Virgin, observation on her hymn, iii. 203.

"Men uncircumcised," signifies proselytes of the gate, ii. 290.

"Messenger of Satan," &c. remarks upon these words, ii. 207, 208.

Metaphors and allegories in Scripture, need a key to open the sense that is couched under them, ii. 377.

Millennium, state of the promised under the patriarchal dispensation, iii. 40.

Minister, whence the term, ii. 16.
Miracle, definition of one by Dr. Clarke, i. 232. a true one how distinguished from a false one, ii. 94.
"More sure word of prophecy," observations on these words, iii. 257.
Moses, observations on his request that God would show him His glory, iii. 31. expected an everlasting possession of Canaan, 210.
Mystery, meaning of the term in the New Testament, ii. 45.

Nachash, the Tempter, why so called by Moses, ii. 428.
New Testament, the, cannot be understood without a critical knowledge of the Old, iii. 260.
Nicholas, the deacon, probably the author of the sect of Nicolaitans, i. 35.
Nicodemus, remarks on our Lord's discourse with him, 101.
Noah, probably the only antediluvian who had kept free from the forbidden intermarriages which gave occasion to the deluge, ii. 462. the blessing pronounced upon him, 463—475. 489.

Old Testament, the, a knowledge of it necessary to a sound interpretation of the New Testament, iii. 260.
Origen, his testimony concerning the recent existence of miraculous gifts, i. 222. best acquainted of any of the fathers with Jewish learning, ii. 277.
Παῤῥησία, import of this word in the New Testament, ii. 60.
Pastors and teachers, nature of their office, i. 50.
Paul, St., his description of *conscience*, i. 3. on the time when he received the miraculous powers of the Spirit, 126. appeals in his epistles to the possession by his converts of the miraculous gifts, 210—221. Paul and Barnabas chosen to testify the resurrection of Christ, ii. 30. they alone were the apostles of the Gentiles, 106. on his speaking by *permission*, 51. power of inflicting diseases

granted to him, 65. the time when he received the Holy Ghost considered, 77. the Holy Ghost imparted to him immediately, as on the other apostles, 84. a peculiar gift possessed by him, 90. his preaching to the Gentiles called his peculiar gospel, 120. his epistles written only to believing Gentiles, 122. the other apostles wrote only to the Jews or proselytes, 123. remarks on the style of his epistle to the Hebrews, *ibid.* reason of his personal defects, 134. compared with the other apostles, 135. and particularly with St. Peter, 136. none of the apostles at Jerusalem at his second visit to that city, 141. received his apostleship then, 194. *Saul the aged*, remarks on these words, 153. of the time when he and Barnabas became apostles, 181. on the light which appeared at his conversion, 184. and on the voice which addressed him, 185. whether he saw the Lord on the way to Damascus, 187. not made an apostle by Ananias, 189. first preaches to the idolatrous Gentiles at Antioch in Pisidia, 200. did not communicate his preaching to the Gentiles to the church at large at Jerusalem till the fifth time of his visit there, 218. the probable reason why he was so solicitous about the collection of alms for the church at Jerusalem, 220—223. observations on what he calls "his gospel," 225. why he commenced preaching in Arabia, 233. meaning of his words, Acts ix. 2., 234, 235. remarkable change in his conduct after his second journey to Jerusalem, ii. 238. —240. works no extraordinary cures till after his second visit to Jerusalem, 243. and then first changes his name from Saul to Paul, *ibid.* first called an apostle (Acts xiv. 14.) at Lystra, 245. Barnabas always named before him by St. Luke till after his second visit to Jerusalem, why, 247. why urged by James and the elders to take upon him a vow, 332. his rebuke of St. Peter considered and explained, 335, 336.

Pentecost and Ascension, causes of the interval between them, i. 134. nature of the feast, 138.

"People," λαὸς, in the New Testament denotes Jews only, ii. 111.

2 Peter i. 19. meaning of this passage, i. 239—243.

Peter, remark on his striking Ananias and Sapphira dead, ii. 66. preaches to Cornelius and the proselytes of the gate, 108. his epistles to whom written, *ibid.* observation on his reference to an epistle of St. Paul, 128. always president at Jerusalem before the dispersion, *ibid.* Peter and John in what sense called *elders*, 153. on his eating with the Gentiles, 334.

Philip, could not confer the gift of the Holy Spirit, ii. 72.

"Praying with the Spirit," observations on it, i. 45.

Prophecy, spirit of, having ceased in Malachi revives in Zacharias, Simeon, &c., i. 8. character of the intervening period, *ibid.* brief view of the predictions concerning the Baptist, our Lord, and the miraculous gifts, 200. the spirit of prophecy, after the Ascension, compared with what it was under the Jewish dispensation, 225. why appealed to by our Lord, 251. argument from it of less weight than from facts, 252.

"Prophesying," under the Christian dispensation, what, i. 38.

Prophets under the Christian dispensation, character of them, i. 52. ii. 53. their peculiar duty, what, 28.

Proselytes of the gate, their character, ii. 271. St. Peter preaching to them, 108. in the opinion of the Jews at and before our Saviour's time, not bound to keep the Sabbath, 277. reason of the prohibitions of Moses concerning them, 278, 279. those of Antioch in Syria first converted by the men of Cyprus and Cyrene, 281. more numerous in Syria and Cilicia than elsewhere, 299.

Psalms, observations on the denunciations contained in them, iii. 239.

"Quickened by the Spirit," meaning of these words, iii. 54.

Ramsay, Chevalier, proves that the creation, fall, and restoration of man, are to be clearly traced in the heathen mythology, ii. 452.

Rational divines, errors committed by them, ii. 366.

"Restitution (or respiration) of all things," what, ii. 513.

Resurrection of our Lord, the first duty of the apostles was to certify the truth of it, ii. 26.

Revelation, means of it before the fall, i. 1. after the fall, to mankind in general, 3. and to particular individuals by His Holy Spirit, 5. source of the difficulties which prevent a right apprehension of it, ii. 365. use of its peculiar doctrines, 367. leisure, care, and ability necessary to arrive at the true sense of it, ii. 370. progressively imparted, 378. those divines who have considered it historically the best critics, 379. the SINGLE NOTION, which runs through it, what, *ibid.* and 382. object of it, iii. 17.

"Receive ye the Holy Ghost," remarks on these words, i. 15, 16.

Receiving of strangers, an important duty in the early ages of the Christian church, 81.

"Remember them which have the rule over you," Heb. xiii. 7. meaning of these words, i. 88.

"Receiving the Holy Ghost," different from "being full of the Holy Ghost," i. 164.

Righteousness, meaning of, under the Mosaic dispensation, ii. 494.

Sabbath, proselytes of the gate not bound to keep it, according to the opinion of the Jews, at and before our Saviour's time, ii. 277.

Sacrifices, divinely appointed, ii. 441. to be slain at the door of the tabernacle, why, 272. hopes from their institution of a restoration to paradise conceived by the antediluvians, 440. intermitted from the time soon after the flood until the time of Moses, iii. 44.

Sadducees, the true force of the argument employed against

them by our Lord, ii. 503—506. iii. 159.
Samaritans, on the imparting of the Holy Ghost to them, i. 129—134.
Sanchoniatho, seems to have written the history of the descendants of Cain, ii. 465.
Saturn, remarks on the fables concerning him, iii. 51.
Sceptics and deists, difference between them, ii. 373, 374.
"Seed of the woman," observations on the expression, iii. 153.
Selden, on the proselytes of the gate, ii. 271.
"Sending forth," does not signify ordination, ii. 259.
"Separating," does not signify ordaining, ii. 256.
Septuagint, πάροικοι used by them to denote the "proselytes of the gate," ii. 108.
"Serpent, the," remarks on his nature, character, and temptation, ii. 427—433. why so called by Moses, 429—432. iii. 9. the sentence on him, 434.
Seth, as well as Christ, meant by "the seed of the woman," ii. 450. 454. in what sense Adam is said to have begotten him in "his own likeness," iii. 270.
Seventy, the, appointed on the termination of the first apostolic commission, ii. 6. the title not given in the New Testament to any of the disciples, why, 39.
Shechinah, meaning and derivation of the word, iii. 38. placed at the entrance of Eden, iii. 278.
"Shall not be forgiven in the world to come," meaning of these words, i. 245.
Shem, the blessing pronounced on him, ii. 475.
Sherlock, Bishop, his reason why the name *serpent* was given to the Tempter by Moses, ii. 430.
Shinar, causes of the dispersion there, ii. 477.
Silas, why called Sylvanus by St. Peter, ii. 114.
Siloam, observation on the custom of fetching water from it at the feast of tabernacles, i. 157.
Sin against the Holy Ghost, what, i. 245.
Sinai, nature of the covenant of "life" there, iii. 211.

"Singing with the Spirit," what, i. 40.
Son, implies resemblance in Scripture, ii. 397.
"Sons of God," (Gen. iv.) signified good men, ii. 450. 454. iii. 145. 273. sometimes mentioned in Scripture, in opposition to the children of men, 455.
Soul, its consciousness depends on its union with the body, iii. 161—174. 274.
"Speaking by permission," meaning of the expression, ii. 51.
Spencer, Dr., his learned dissertation on the apostolical decree, ii. 267. character of his writings, 269.
Spirit of prophecy, as it existed under the Jewish dispensation compared with it as it was after the Ascension, i. 225.
"Spiritual songs," what, i. 41.
"Spiritual gifts," (1 Cor. ii. 15.) what, 70—72. right classification of them in the primitive church, 74. 77.
"Strangers," import of the term in the New Testament, ii. 111.
"Strangled things," meaning of the expression in the apostolical decree, ii. 269, 270.
Sykes, Mr., his remarks on the meaning of the words "kingdom of heaven," ii. 3.
Syriac version, the most accurate, ii. 115.

Teachers and pastors, in the primitive church, nature of their office, i. 50.
Temptation of Adam and Eve, detail of it, iii. 4. statement and refutation of the objections to the literal account of it, 15.
Tempter of Adam and Eve, nature and character of him, ii. 427. iii. 4, 5.
"The God of glory appeared to Abraham," meaning of these words, iii. 28.
"Those that are lords over you," explained, i. 64.

Timothy, on his receiving the Holy Spirit by the hands of St. Paul alone, ii. 86.
Titus, probably converted at Antioch, ii. 327. criticism of Grotius and Mill concerning him, 328.
Tongues, gift of, remarks on, i. 102. common to all, 108.
Tongues, cloven, observations on, i. 109.
"Tree of knowledge," its nature and effects, ii. 413.
"Tree of life," what its virtue probably was, ii. 408.
Thief, the penitent, remarks on our Lord's promise to him, iii. 275.
"Time of restitution (or respiration) of all things," what, ii. 513.

Vow, a, the only voluntary part of the Jewish polity, ii. 332.

Wake, Archbishop, the accuracy of his opinion concerning the epistle of Barnabas questioned, ii. 125.
Wicked, the, inferences respecting a resurrection drawn from their punishment, iii. 231.
"Wise men," meaning of the appellation, ii. 44.
Witnessing of the Spirit, necessity of it, i. 168. 178. in what it consists, 225. its superiority to all other testimonies in favour of the truth of the Christian religion, 230.
Word, the Eternal, the means by which God conversed with man before the fall, i. 2.
"*Word* of *wisdom*," nature of the gift, i. 23. peculiar to the apostles, ii. 44. 48.
"Word of knowledge," nature of, i. 27. ii. 48.

Zacharias, observations on his hymn, iii. 203.

THE END.

PRINTED BY A. J. VALPY, RED LION COURT, FLEET STREET, LONDON.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01147 2877